



भारत का राजपत्र The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित
PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

सं० 7]
No. 7]

नई दिल्ली, शनिवार, फरवरी 13, 1993/माघ 24, 1914
NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1993/MAGHA 24, 1914

इस भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह अलग संकलन के रूप में
रखा जा सके

Separate Paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a
separate compilation

भाग II—खण्ड 3—उप-खण्ड (II)
PART II—Section 3—Sub-Section (II)

भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों (रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़कर) द्वारा जारी किए गए सांविधिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएं
Statutious issued by the Ministries of the Government of India (other than
the Ministry of Defence)

विधि और न्याय मंत्रालय
(विधि कार्य विभाग)
न्यायिक अनुभाग
सूचना

नई दिल्ली, 22 जनवरी, 1993

का.आ. 247.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के
अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है
कि श्री काली किशोर भट्टाचार्य, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी
को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस
बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे कलकत्ता (पश्चिम बंगाल) में
व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी
भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन
के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं. 5(11)/93-न्यायिक]

पी.सी. कण्णन, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

MINISTRY OF LAW, JUSTICE & COMPANY AFFAIRS
(Department of Legal Affairs)
JUDICIAL SECTION
NOTICE

New Delhi, the 22nd January, 1993

S.O. 247.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent
Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Act, 1956,

that application has been made to the said Authority, under
Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Kalikishor Bhattacharya,
Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Calcutta
(West Bengal).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person
as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned
within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(11)/93-Judl.]

P. C. KANNAN. Competent Authority

सूचना

नई दिल्ली, 22 जनवरी, 1993

का.आ. 248.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के
अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है
कि श्री ज्ञान सिंह, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम
के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है
कि उसे दिल्ली संघ क्षेत्र में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी
के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना
के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे
पास भेजा जाए।

[सं. 5(266)/92-न्यायिक]

पी.सी. कण्णन, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

(371)

NOTICE

New Delhi, the 22nd January, 1993

S.O. 248.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Act, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Gian Singh, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in U.T. of Delhi.

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(266)/92-Judl]

P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority

सूचना

नई दिल्ली, 22 जनवरी, 1993

का.आ. 249.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री राज कुमार श्रीवास्तव, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे इलाहाबाद (उत्तर प्रदेश) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से भेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं. 5(10)/93-न्यायिक]

पी.सी. कण्णन, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

NOTICE

New Delhi, the 22nd January, 1993

S.O. 249.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Act, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Raj Kumar Srivastava, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Allahabad (U.P.).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(10)/93-Judl.]

P. C. KANNAN, Competent Authority

कार्मिक, लोक शिकायत तथा पेंशन मंत्रालय

(पेंशन एवं पेंशनभोगी कल्याण विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 18 जनवरी, 1993

का.आ. 250.—राष्ट्रपति, संविधान के अनुच्छेद 148 के खंड (5) के साथ पठित अनुच्छेद 309 के परन्तुक द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और भारतीय लेखा परीक्षा तथा लेखा विभाग में सेवारत व्यक्तियों के संबंध में भारत के नियंत्रक और महालेखा परीक्षक से परामर्श करने के पश्चात्, केन्द्रीय सिविल सेवा (पेंशन) नियम, 1972 का और संशोधन करने के लिए, निम्नलिखित नियम बनाते हैं; अर्थात् :—

1.(1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम केन्द्रीय सिविल सेवा (पेंशन) प्रथम संशोधन नियम, 1993 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख को प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. केन्द्रीय सिविल सेवा (पेंशन) नियम, 1972 में नियम 54 के उपनियम (14) के खण्ड (ख) के उपखंड (ii) में, "सेवा निवृत्ति से पूर्व" शब्दों का शेष किया जाएगा।

[संख्या 1(66)-पी एवं पी डब्ल्यू/89(ई)]

सर्वर्ण दास, उप सचिव

पाठ-टिप्पणः—केन्द्रीय सिविल सेवा (पेंशन) नियम, 1972 को का.आ. 934 तारीख 1-4-1972 के रूप में प्रकाशित किया गया था। नियमों का चतुर्थ संस्करण (जुलाई 1988 तक संशोधित) 1988 में प्रकाशित किया गया था। उक्त नियमों के पश्चात्तर्ती संशोधन पेंशन और पेंशन भोगी कल्याण विभाग की निम्नलिखित अधिसूचनाओं द्वारा किए गए :—

क्रम सं.	अधिसूचना संख्या	तारीख
1.	का.आ. संख्या 254	4-2-1989
2.	का.आ. सं. 970	6-5-1989
3.	का.आ. सं. 2467	7-10-1989
4.	का.आ. सं. 899	14-4-1990
5.	का.आ. सं. 1454	26-5-1990
6.	का.आ. सं. 2329	6-9-1990
7.	का.आ. सं. 3269	8-12-1990
8.	का.आ. सं. 3270	8-12-1990
9.	का.आ. सं. 3273	8-12-1990
10.	का.आ. सं. 409	9-12-1991
11.	का.आ. सं. 464	16-2-1992
12.	फा. 7(14)-पीएंडपीडब्ल्यू/एफ/90	23-8-1991
13.	फा. 4(15)-पीएंडपीडब्ल्यू/88-डी	9-10-1991
14.	फा. 7(10)-पीएंडपीडब्ल्यू/89-एफ	28-11-1991
15.	फा. 28(40)-पीएंडपीडब्ल्यू/88-बी	9-1-1992
16.	फा. 38(189)-पीएंडपीडब्ल्यू/88-एफ	4-2-1992
17.	43/4/92-पीएंड पी डब्ल्यू/जी	27-11-1992
18.	1(10)-पी एंड पी डब्ल्यू/ई	31-12-1992

MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, P.G. & PENSIONS

(Department of Pension & P.W.)

New Delhi, the 18th January, 1993

S.O. 258.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the proviso to article 309, read with clause (5) of article 148, of the Constitution and after consultation with the Comptroller and Auditor General of India in relation to persons serving in the Indian Audit and Accounts Department, the President hereby makes the following rules further to amend the Central Civil Services (Pension) Rules, namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Central Civil Services (Pension) First Amendment Rules, 1993.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In rule 54 of the Central Civil Services (Pension) Rules, 1972, in sub-rule (14), in clause (b), in sub-clause (ii), the words "before retirement" shall be omitted.

[No. 1(66)-P&PW/89-E]
SWARAN, DASS, Dy. Secy.

The Central Civil Services (Pension) Rules, 1972 were published as S.O. No. 934 dated 1-4-1972. The Fourth Edition (corrected upto July, 1988) of the Rules was published in 1988. These rules were subsequently amended vide Department of Pension & Pensioners Welfare Notification given below :—

S. No.	Notification No.	Date
1.	S.O. No. 254 4-2-1989	
2.	S.O. No. 970 6-5-1989	
3.	S.O. No. 2467 7-10-1989	
4.	S.O. No. 899 7-10-1990	
5.	S.O. No. 454 26-5-1990	
6.	S.O. No. 2329 6-9-1990	
7.	S.O. No. 3269 8-12-1990	
8.	S.O. No. 3270 8-12-1990	
9.	S.O. No. 3273 8-12-1990	
10.	S.O. No. 409 9-12-1991	
11.	S.O. No. 464 16-2-1991	
12.	F.7(14)-P&PW/F/90 23-8-1991	
13.	F. 4(15)-P&PW/88-D 9-10-1991	
14.	F. 7(10)-P&PW/88-F 28-11-1991	
15.	F. 28(40)-P&PW/88-B 9-1-1992	
16.	F. 38(189)-P&PW/88-F 4-2-1992	
17.	F. 43/4/92-P&PW(G) 27-11-1992	
18.	F. 1(10)-P&PW/92-E 31-12-1992.	

नई दिल्ली, 18 जनवरी, 1993

का.आ. 251.—राष्ट्रपति, संविधान के अनुच्छेद 148 के खंड (5) के साथ पठित अनुच्छेद 309 के परन्तुक द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और भारतीय लेखापरीक्षा और लेखा विभाग में सेवारत व्यक्तियों के संबंध में भारत के नियंत्रक महालेखापरीक्षक से परामर्श करने के पश्चात् अभिदायी भविष्य निधि नियम (भारत), 1962 का और संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाते हैं, अर्थात् :—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम अभिदायी भविष्य निधि (भारत) संशोधन नियम, 1993 है।

(2) ये 1 मार्च, 1992 से प्रवृत्त हुए समझे जाएंगे।

2. अभिदायी भविष्य निधि नियम (भारत), 1962 के नियम 8 के उपनियम (1) में, उपखंड (ख) के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित खंड रखा जाएगा, अर्थात् :—

“(ख) वह इस प्रकार व्यक्त की गई कोई भी रकम हो सकती है जो उसकी उपलब्धियों से अधिक और उपलब्धियों के दस प्रतिशत से कम नहीं होगी।”

[सं. 20(15)/पी.एंडपी.डब्ल्यू/90-ई]

स्वर्ण दास, उप सचिव

स्पष्टीकरण शासन:—भारत सरकार ने कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि में कर्मचारी अभिदान/नियोक्ता अंश अभिदाय के पुनरीक्षण को ध्यान में रखते हुए, अभिदायी भविष्य निधि में कर्मचारी अभिदान/नियोक्ता अंश अभिदाय को भी 1-3-1992 से विद्यमान 8-1/3 प्रतिशत से बढ़ाकर 10 प्रतिशत करने का विनिश्चय किया है। यह प्रस्तावित किया जाता है कि इस संशोधन से इन नियमों द्वारा शासित किसी भी कर्मचारी पर प्रतिकूल प्रभाव नहीं पड़ेगा।

टिप्पण:—अभिदायी भविष्य निधि नियम (भारत), 1962 (16-2-87 तक संशोधित) का दूसरा संस्करण द्वि-भाषीय रूप में निकाला जा चुका है। इन नियमों में तत्पश्चात् नीचे उल्लिखित अधिसूचनाओं द्वारा संशोधन किया गया है :—

1. फ. 20(11)-पीएंडपीडब्ल्यू/86-I दिनांक 9-11-90
2. फ. 13(5)-पी एंडपीडब्ल्यू/90-ई दिनांक 27-11-90
3. फ. 13(4)-पीएंडपीडब्ल्यू/90-ई दिनांक 3-12-90
4. फ. 20(26)-पीएंडपीडब्ल्यू/88-I दिनांक 2-5-91

New Delhi, the 18th January, 1993

S.O. 251.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the proviso to article 309 read with clause (5) of article 148 of the Constitution and after consultation with the Comptroller & Auditor General in relation to persons serving in the Indian Audit and Accounts Department, the President hereby makes the following rules further to amend the Contributory Provident Fund Rules (India), 1962, namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Contributory Provident Fund (India) Amendment Rules, 1993.

(2) They shall be deemed to have come into force from the 1st March, 1992.

2. In rule 8 of the Contributory Provident Fund Rules (India), 1962, in sub-rule (1) for clause (b), the following clause shall be substituted, namely :—

“(b) It may be any sum, so expressed not less than ten per cent of the emoluments and not more than his emoluments.”

[No. 20(15)-P&PW/90-E]
SWARAN DASS, Dy. Secy.

EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM

In the light of revision of employee's subscription/employer's share of contribution to the Employees Provident Fund from 8-1/3 per cent to 10 per cent the Government of India have also decided to enhance the employees subscription/employer's share of contribution to the CPF from the existing 8-1/3 per cent to 10 per cent w.e.f. 1-3-1992. It is certified that none of the employees governed by these rules will be adversely affected with this amendment.

NOTE

The second edition of the Contributory Provident Fund (India), Rules 1962 (corrected upto 16-2-87) has since been brought out in diglot form. The rules have subsequently been amended vide the notifications mentioned below :—

1. F. 20(11)-P&PW/86-E dated 9-11-90
2. F. 13(5)-P&PW/90-F dated 27-11-90
3. F. 13(4)-P&PW/90-E dated 3-12-90
4. F. 20(26)-P&PW/88-E dated 2-5-1991.

(कामिक और प्रशिक्षण विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 19 जनवरी, 1993

का.आ. 252.—केन्द्रीय सरकार दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन अधिनियम, 1946 (1946 का 25) की धारा 3 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए एतद्द्वारा निम्नलिखित अपराधों को ऐसे अपराधों के रूप में विनिर्दिष्ट करती है जिनका दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन द्वारा अन्वेषण किया जाना है यथा:—

(क) पराक्रम्य लिखित अधिनियम, 1881 (1881 का 26) की धारा 138 के अन्तर्गत दण्यनीय अपराध, और

(ख) ऊपर वर्णित किसी एक या अधिक अपराधों और वैसे ही संयवहार के अनुक्रम में किए गए किसी अन्य अपराध या अपराधों के संबंध में या उनसे संसक्त प्रयत्न, दुष्प्रेरण और षड्यंत्र।

[संख्या 228/32/92-ए. सी. डी.-II]

ए. सी. शर्मा, अवसर सचिव

(Department of Personnel & Training)

New Delhi, the 19th January, 1993

S.O. 252.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 3 of the Delhi Special Police Establishment Act, 1946 (Act No. 25 of 1946), the Central Government hereby specifies, the following offences as the offences which are to be investigated by the Delhi Special Police Establishment, namely:—

(a) Offences punishable under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 (Act No. 26 of 1881),

and

(b) Attempts, abetments and conspiracies in relation to or in connection with one or more of the offences mentioned above and any other offence or offences committed in the course of the same transaction.

[No. 228/32/92-AVD. II]

A. C. SHARMA, Under Secy.

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 20 जनवरी, 1993

का.आ. 253.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन अधिनियम, 1946 की धारा 6 के साथ पठित धारा 5 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए आन्ध्र प्रदेश गृह (एससी.ए.) विभाग की अधिसूचना जी.ओ.एम.एस. नं. 11 दि. 18-1-1993 द्वारा दी गई गई सत्रमति से धारा 25 ग्रामर्स एक्ट 1959 (एक्ट नं. 54/1959) सपठित धारा 436 भारतीय दंड संहिता 1860 (एक्ट नं. 45/1860) धारा 3 व 5 इंडियन एक्सप्लोसिव एक्ट 1908 (एक्ट नं. 6/1908), धारा 3 व 4 एक्ट टेरोरिस्ट एक्टिविटीज (प्रिवेन्शन) एक्ट 1987) एक्ट नं. 28/1987) एवं धारा 174 क्रिमिनल प्रोसीजर कोड 1973 (एक्ट नं. 2/1974) के अधीन दण्यनीय अपराधों के और उक्त

अपराधों के संबंधों में या उनसे संबंधित प्रयत्नों, दुष्प्रेरणों और षड्यंत्रों के तथा उक्त तथ्यों पर आधारित किसी अन्य अपराधों के लिए जो थाना हारबोर, विशाखापटनम के केस एफ.आई.आर. नं. 4/93 दिनांक 17-1-93 से संबंधित हैं, के अन्वेषण के लिए दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन के सदस्यों की शक्तियों और अधिकारिता का विस्तारण सम्पूर्ण आन्ध्र प्रदेश राज्य पर करती है।

[संख्या 228/4/93-ए. सी. डी.-II]

ए. सी. शर्मा, अवसर सचिव

ORDER

New Delhi, the 20th January, 1993

S.O. 253.—In exercise of powers conferred by Sub-Section (1) of Section 5 read with section 6 of the Delhi Special Police Establishment Act, 1946 (Act 25 of 1946), the Central Government with the consent of Government of Andhra Pradesh vide Home (SCA) Department GO MS 11 dated 18-1-93 hereby extends the powers and jurisdiction of the members of the Delhi Special Police Establishment to the whole of the State of Andhra Pradesh for the investigation of the offences punishable u/s 25 of the Indian Arms Act 1959 (Act No. 54 of 1959) r/w Sec. 436 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Act 45 of 1860), Sections 3 & 5 of the Explosive Substances Act, 1908 (Act No. 6 of 1908), Sections 3 & 4 of the Terrorists & Disruptive Activities (Prevention) Act, 1987 (Act 2 of 1987) and Section 174 of the Criminal Procedure Code, 1973 (Act 2 of 1974), and attempts, abetment and conspiracies in relation to or in connection with the said offences and any other offences committed in the course of the same transaction arising out of the same facts in regard to case F.I.R. No. 4/93 of Police Station Harbour, Visakhapatnam dated 17-1-93.

[No. 228/4/93-AVD|II]

A. C. SHARMA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 20 जनवरी, 1993

का.आ. 254.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, दंड प्रक्रिया संहिता, 1973 (1974 का 2) की धारा 24 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए जिला और सेशन न्यायाधीश (विशेष न्यायाधीश) पालघाट, केरल के न्यायालय में फावर जी, इग्नेटियस, निदेशक, सेंट एन्टोनी गिल्ड, मद्रास और अन्य के विरुद्ध मामला आर.सी. सं. 2/85-सी आई यू (ई) 2 के अभियोजन का संचालन करने के लिए श्री पी. ई. बेरियन अधिवक्ता, एरनाकुलम को विशेष लोक अभियोजक नियुक्त करती है।

[सं. 225/14/92-ए. सी. डी.-2]

ए. सी. शर्मा, अवसर सचिव

New Delhi, the 20th January, 1993

S.O. 254.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-Section (8) of Section 24 of the Code of Criminal Procedure 1973 (Act 2 of 1974), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri P. E. Cherian, Advocate, Ernakulam as Special Public Prosecutor for conducting the prosecution of the case RC No. 2/85-SIU(E)II against Fr. G. Ignatius, Director ST Antony's Guild, Madras and others in the Court of District & Session Judge (Special Judge), Palghat, Kerala.

[No. 225/14/92-AVD.II]

A. C. SHARMA, Under Secy.

आदेश

विन संज्ञा

नई दिल्ली, 20 जनवरी, 1993

सुख्या सं. 228/3/93-ए बी डी-II

(राज्य विभाग)

का.आ. 255.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन अधिनियम, 1946 (1946 का अधिनियम, 25) की धारा 6 के साथ पठित धारा 5 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए पुलिस स्टेशन सोपोर, जिला बरामूला के अन्तर्गत रजिस्टर किए गए मामला संख्या 8/93 व 9/93 दिनांक 6-1-93 के बाबत रनबीर बंड संहिता की धारा 302, 307, 436 व 392 एवं आतंकवादी और विध्वंसकारी क्रियाकलाप (निवारण) अधिनियम 1987 (1987 का अधिनियम, 28) की धारा 3 एवं 4 तथा भारतीय शस्त्र अधिनियम, 1959 (1959 का अधिनियम, 54) की धारा 3/25 एवं विस्फोटक पदार्थ अधिनियम 1908 की धारा 3/5 के अधीन दण्डनीय अपराधों और उक्त अपराधों और उन्हीं तथ्यों से उत्पन्न होने वाले वैसे ही संव्यवहार के अनुक्रम में किए गए किन्हीं अन्य अपराधों, के संबंध में या उनसे संसक्त प्रयत्नों, दुष्प्रेरणों और पद्धतियों के अन्वेषण के लिए जम्मू और कश्मीर शासन के गृह विभाग के 1993 के आदेश संख्या होम 20 (आई एस ए) 93 दिनांक 13-1-93 के तहत जम्मू और कश्मीर सरकार की सहमति से दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन के सदस्यों की शक्तियों और अधिकारिता का विस्तारण सम्पूर्ण जम्मू और कश्मीर राज्य पर करती है।

[संख्या 228/3/93-ए बी डी-II]

ए. सी. शर्मा, अवसर सचिव

ORDER

New Delhi, the 20th January, 1993

S.O. 55.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-Section (1) of Section 5 read with Section 6 of the Delhi Special Police Establishment Act, 1946 (Act 20 of 1946), the Central Government with the consent of Government of Jammu and Kashmir vide Home Dept. Order No. Home/20(ISA) of 1993 dated 13-1-1993 hereby extends the powers and jurisdiction of the members of the Delhi Special Police Establishment to the whole of the State of Jammu and Kashmir for the investigation of the offences punishable under section 3 and 4 of the Terrorist and Disruptive Activities (Prevention) Act, 1987, (Act 28 of 1987), Section 302, 307, 436 and 392 of Ranbir Penal Code, Sections 5/25 Indian Arms Act (Act 54 of 1959) and Sections 3/5 Explosive Substances Act, and any attempts, abetments and conspiracy in relation to or in connection with the said offences or any other offences committed in the course of the same transaction arising out of same fact or facts in the two cases registered vide FIR No. 8/93 and 9/93 dated 6-1-93 of Police Station, Sopore, District Bara-mullah (J&K).

[No. 228/3/93-AVD.11]

A. C. SHARMA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 6 जनवरी, 1993

का.आ. 256.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, केन्द्रीय राज्य बोर्ड अधिनियम 1963 (1963 का 54) के मन्ड-3 खंड (2) में प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, भारतीय राजस्व सेवा (आयकर) के अधिकारियों, श्री टी. एस. श्रीनिवासन को, जो इससे पूर्व मुख्य आयकर अधिकारी नई दिल्ली, के रूप में तैनात थे, दिनांक 1 जनवरी, 1993 (पूर्वाह्न) से और अगला आदेश होने तक केन्द्रीय उत्पन्न कर बोर्ड का सदस्य नियुक्त करती है।

[का.सं. ए-19011/1/93-प्रशा. 1]

रमेश कुमार, अवसर सचिव

MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Revenue)

New Delhi, the 6th January, 1993

HEADQUARTERS ESTABLISHMENT

S.O. 256.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of Section 3 of the Central Board of Revenue Act, 1963 (No. 54 of 1963), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri T. S. Srinivasan an officer of the Indian Revenue Service (Income-tax) and formerly posted as Chief Commissioner of Income-tax, New Delhi, as Member of the Central Board of Direct Taxes with effect from the forenoon of the 1st January, 1993 and until further orders.

[F. No. A-19011/1/93-Ad.I]

RAMESH KUMAR, Under Secy.

सीमाशुल्क सं. 8/93 एन टी

नई दिल्ली, 30 जनवरी, 1993

का.आ. 257.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, सीमाशुल्क अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 52) की धारा 6 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, भारत सरकार के वित्त मंत्रालय (राजस्व विभाग) की अधिसूचना सं. 42-सीमाशुल्क, तारीख 27 मार्च, 1965 में निम्नलिखित और संशोधन करती है, अर्थात्:—

उक्त अधिसूचना में, "तंजावूर, तिरुनेलवेली" शब्दों के स्थान पर "तंजावूर, कुड्डे-मिलपैथ, तिरुनेलवेली" शब्द रखे जाएंगे।

[का. सं. 394/224/92-सीमाशुल्क (ए एस)]

आर. डी. नेगी, अवसर सचिव

New Delhi, the 30th January, 1993

CUSTOM NO. 8/93 (N.T.)

S.O. 257.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 6 of the Customs Act, 1962 (52 of 1962), the Central Govt.

Government hereby makes the following further amendments in the Notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Finance (Department of Revenue) No. 42 Customs, dated the 27th March, 1965, namely :—

In the said notification, for the words "Thanjavur, Tirunelveli", the words "Thanjavur, Quaid-e-Milleth, Tirunelveli" shall be substituted.

[F. No. 394/224/92-CUS(AS)]

R. D. NEGI, Under Secy.

(केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड)

नई दिल्ली, 19 जनवरी, 1993

का.आ. 258.—आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 119 की उपधारा (2) के खंड (क) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड एतद्वारा आदेश देता है कि :—

(1) ऐसी किसी कंपनी कर-निर्धारित की समस्या में, जिसमें आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 139 की उपधारा (1) के स्पष्टीकरण के उपबंधों के अधीन कर निर्धारण वर्ष 1992-93 के लिए आय/हानि की विवरणों को दिसंबर, 1992 के 31वें दिन तक प्रस्तुत किया जाना था, वहां पर उक्त निश्चित तारीख को 31 जनवरी, 1993 तक बढ़ाया गया समझा जाएगा।

(2) ऐसी किसी कंपनी कर-निर्धारित की समस्या में, जिसमें आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 44 एबी के स्पष्टीकरण के उपबंधों के अधीन कर लेखा-परीक्षा रिपोर्ट को कर-निर्धारण वर्ष 1992-93 के लिए दिसंबर, 1992 के 31वें दिन तक प्राप्त किया जाना था, वहां पर विनिर्दिष्ट तिथि को 31 जनवरी, 1993 तक बढ़ाया गया समझा जाएगा।

[फा. सं. 220/12/92-आई. टी. ए. II]

अजय कुमार, अवर सचिव

(Central Board of Direct Taxes)

New Delhi, the 19th January, 1993

S.O. 258.—In exercise of the powers conferred under clause (a) of sub-section (2) of Section 119 of the Income-tax Act, 1961, the Central Board of Direct Taxes hereby orders that:

(i) In the case of company assesses, where, under the provisions of the Explanation to Section 33AB of Section 139 of Income-tax Act, 1961, the return of income/loss for Assessment Year 1992-93 had to be furnished by the 31st day of December 1992, the said due date shall be deemed to have been extended to 31st January, 1993.

(ii) In the case of company assesses, where, under the provisions of the Explanation to Section 44AB of the Income-tax Act, 1961, the Tax Audit Report had to be obtained by the 31st day of December 1992, for Assessment Year 1992-93, the specified date shall be deemed to have been extended to 31st January, 1993.

[F. No. 220/12/92-ITA.II]

AJAY KUMAR, Under Secy.

(आर्थिक कार्य विभाग)

(बैंकिंग प्रभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 18 जनवरी, 1993

का.आ. 259.—बैंककारी विनियमन अधिनियम, 1949 (1949 का 10) धारा 53 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक की सिफारिश पर, एतद्वारा घोषणा करती है कि उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-ब की उपधारा (1) तथा (2) के उपबंध बैंक आफ मद्रास लि. पर 29 दिसंबर 1992 से 28 मार्च, 1993 तक तीन महीने की अवधि के बास्ते अथवा बैंक के नियमित पूर्णकालिक अध्यक्ष की नियुक्ति होने तक, इनमें से जो भी पहले हो, लागू नहीं होंगे।

[संख्या 15/10/92-बी.ओ.ए. (1)]

के. के. मंगल, अवर सचिव

(Department of Economic Affairs)

(Banking Division)

New Delhi, the 18th January, 1993

S.O. 259.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 53 of the Banking Regulation Act, 1949 (10 of 1949), the Central Government, on the recommendation of the Reserve Bank of India, hereby declares that the provisions of sub-sections (1) and (2) of section 10-B of the said Act shall not apply to the Bank of Madura Limited for a period of three months from 29th December, 1992 to 28th March, 1993 or till the appointment of a regular wholetime Chairman for the bank, whichever is earlier.

[No. 15/10/92-BOA(1)]

K. K. MANGAL, Under Secy.

शुद्धिपत्र

नई दिल्ली, 19 जनवरी, 1993

का.आ. 260.—भारत सरकार, वित्त मंत्रालय, आर्थिक कार्य विभाग (बैंकिंग प्रभाग) द्वारा जारी 14 जनवरी, 1993 की अधिसूचना सं. 15/2/87-आई.आर. के अंग्रेजी स्पांतर में अधिसूचना की 8वीं और 9वीं पंक्तियों के शब्दों और आंकड़ों "18 जनवरी, 1993 को शुरू होने वाली और 13 जनवरी, 1996 को समाप्त होने वाली तीन वर्षों की अवधि" के स्थान पर "14 जनवरी, 1993 से शुरू होने वाली और 13 जनवरी, 1996 को समाप्त होने वाली तीन वर्षों की अवधि" पढ़ा जाए।

[संख्या एफ. 15/2/87-आई.आर.]

सतपाल भारद्वाज, अवर सचिव

CORRIGENDUM

New Delhi, the 19th January, 1993

S.O. 260.—In the English version of Notification No. 15/2/87-IR Dated 14th January, 1993 issued by the Government of India, Ministry of Finance Department of Economic Affairs (Banking Division) for the words and figures in the 8th and

9th line of the Notification".....three years commencing on 18th January, 1993 and ending with 13th January, 1996" read "....three years commencing from 14th January, 1993 and ending with 13th January, 1996".

[No. F. 15/2/87-IR]

S. BHATIA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 21 जनवरी, 1993

का.आ. 261.—रुग्ण औद्योगिक कंपनियाँ (विशेष उपबंध) अधिनियम, 1985 की धारा 6 के साथ पठित धारा 5 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा कु. कान्ता भट्टनागर, मुख्य न्यायाधीश, मद्रास उच्च न्यायालय को, कार्यभार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से आरम्भ होकर और 14 नवम्बर, 1995 को समाप्त होने वाली अवधि के लिए जब वो 65 वर्ष की आयु की हो जाएगी, औद्योगिक एवं वित्तीय पुनर्निर्माण अपीलीय प्राधिकरण का अध्यक्ष नियुक्त करती है।

[एफ. सं. 7/14/92-बी. ओ. 1]

एम. एस. सीतारामन, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 21st January, 1993

S.O. 261.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 5 read with section 6 of the Sick Industrial Companies (Special Provisions) Act, 1985, the Central Government hereby appoints Kum. Kanta Bhatnagar, retired Chief Justice of Madras High Court, to be the Chairman of the Appellate Authority for Industrial and Financial Reconstruction for a period commencing with the date of her taking charge and ending with 14th November, 1995, the date on which she will attain the age of sixty years.

[F. No. 7/14/92-B.O.]

M. S. SEETHARAMAN, Under Secy.

(वैकिंग प्रभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 22 जनवरी, 1993

का.आ. 262.—राष्ट्रीयकृत थक (प्रबंध और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध) योजना, 1970 के खंड 3 के उपखंड (छ) के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार, श्री ए. एम. एस. शर्मा, प्रबंधक, भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक, अहमदाबाद को, श्री आर. के. चौधरी के स्थान पर एतद्वारा बेजरा बैंक के निदेशक के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[संख्या एफ 9/4/93-बी. ओ. 1]

एम. एस. सीतारामन, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 22nd January, 1993

S.O. 262.—In pursuance of sub-clause (g) of clause 3 of the Nationalised Banks (Management and Miscellaneous Provisions) Scheme, 1970, the Central Government hereby ap-

points Shri A. M. M. Sarma, Manager, Reserve Bank of India, Ahmedabad as a Director of Canara Bank vice Shri R. K. Choudhury.

[F. No. 9/4/93-B.O.]

M. S. SEETHARAMAN, Under Secy.

आई एफ I अनुभाग

नई दिल्ली, 25, जनवरी 1993

का.आ. 263.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, औद्योगिक वित्त निगम अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 15) की धारा 21 की उप धारा (2) के अनुसरण में, भारतीय औद्योगिक वित्त निगम के निदेशक बोर्ड की सिफारिश पर उक्त निगम द्वारा 28 जनवरी, 1993 को जारी किए जाने वाले तथा 28 जनवरी, 2008 को परिपक्व होने वाले बांडों पर देय व्याज की दर एतद्वारा 13% (तेरह प्रतिशत) वार्षिक निर्धारित करती है।

[फा. सं. 2(15)/92,आई.एफ. I]

वी. पी. भारद्वाज, अवर सचिव

I.F.I SECTION

New Delhi, the 25th January, 1993

S.O. 263.—In pursuance of sub-section 2 of Section 21 of the Industrial Finance Corporation Act, 1948 (15 of 1948), the Central Government on the recommendation of the Board of Directors of the Industrial Finance Corporation of India hereby fixes 13% (Thirteen percent) per annum as the rate of interest payable on the bonds to be issued by the said Corporation on 28th January, 1993 and maturing on 28th January, 2008.

[F. No. 2(15)/92-IF.I]

V. P. BHARDWAJ, Under Secy.

वाणिज्य मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 21 जनवरी, 1993

का.आ. 264.—निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1964 के नियम 3 के साथ पठित निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 3 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार डॉ. जी. सुन्दरम, अपर सचिव, वाणिज्य मंत्रालय को अध्यक्ष और निम्नलिखित को नियमित निरीक्षण परिषद् के सदस्यों के रूप में 1 जनवरी, 1993 से दो वर्ष की अवधि के लिए एतद्वारा नामित करती है:—

1. निदेशक निरीक्षण, एवं क्वालिटी नियंत्रण, निर्यात-निरीक्षण परिषद्, नई दिल्ली। सदस्य सचिव
2. महानिदेशक, भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो, नयी दिल्ली पदेन
3. भारत सरकार के कृषि विपणन मलाहतार, नयी दिल्ली पदेन
4. महानिदेशक, आसूचना तथा माध्यमिकी, कलकत्ता पदेन
5. सचिव (तकनीकी विकास) तथा महानिदेशक, तकनीकी विकास उद्योग मंत्रालय, नयी दिल्ली।
6. निदेशक (निर्यात निरीक्षण के प्रभारी) वाणिज्य मंत्रालय, नयी दिल्ली।

7. निदेशक (वित्त प्रभाग) वाणिज्य मंत्रालय, नयी दिल्ली।
8. विकास आयुक्त, लघु उद्योग, नई दिल्ली।
9. विज्ञान तथा तकनीकी विभाग के प्रतिनिधि, भारत सरकार, नयी दिल्ली।
10. निदेशक, सेंट्रल इंस्टीट्यूट ऑफ फिशरीज टेक्नोलॉजी, कोचीन।
11. आपूर्ति तथा निपटान के महानिदेशक के प्रतिनिधि, नयी दिल्ली।
12. निदेशक, फल तथा सब्जी परिरक्षण, नयी दिल्ली।
13. क्वालिटी मार्किंग सेंटर, उद्योग निदेशालय, उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार।
14. क्वालिटी मार्किंग सेंटर, उद्योग निदेशालय, पंजाब सरकार।
15. रेल इंडिया टेक्निकल एंड इकोनॉमिक सर्विसेज लि., नयी दिल्ली, (रेल मंत्रालय), नयी दिल्ली।
16. अध्यक्ष, कृषि उत्पाद निर्यात विकास प्राधिकरण, नयी दिल्ली।
17. अध्यक्ष, मसाला बोर्ड, कोचीन।
18. अध्यक्ष, सीफूड एक्सपोर्ट्स एशोसिएशन, कोचीन।
19. अध्यक्ष, चमड़ा निर्यात परिषद, मद्रास।

13. Quality Marking Centre, Directorate of Industries, Govt. of U.P.
14. Quality Marking Centre, Directorate of Industries, Govt. of U.P.
15. Rail India Technical and Economic Services Ltd., New Delhi, Ministry of Railways, New Delhi.
16. Chairman, Agricultural Products Export Development Authority, New Delhi.
17. Chairman, Spices Board, Cochin.
18. President, Seafood Exporters' Association, Cochin.
19. Chairman, Council for Leather Exports, Madras.

[F. No. 3/90/85-EI&EP]

Km. SUMA SUBBANNA, Director

(मुख्य नियंत्रक आयात-निर्यात का कार्यालय)

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 20 जनवरी, 93

[फाइल सं. 3/90/85-ईआई एंड ईपी]

शुमारी सुमा सुब्बण्ण, निदेशक

MINISTRY OF COMMERCE

New Delhi, the 21st January, 1993

S.O. 264.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 3 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), read with Rule 3 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1964, the Central Government hereby appoints Dr. G. Sundaram, Additional Secretary, Ministry of Commerce, as Chairman and nominates the following members of the Export Inspection Council for a period of 2 years w.e.f. 1st January, 1993 :—

1. Director of Inspection and Quality Control Export Inspection Council, New Delhi. Member Secretary
2. Director General of Bureau of Indian Standards, New Delhi. Ex-officio
3. Agricultural Marketing Adviser to the Government of India, New Delhi. Ex-officio
4. Director General of Commercial Intelligence and Statistics, Calcutta. Ex-officio
5. Secretary (Technical Development) and Director General Technical Development, Ministry of Industry, New Delhi.
6. Director (Incharge of Export Inspection), Ministry of Commerce, New Delhi.
7. Director (Finance Division), Ministry of Commerce, New Delhi.
8. Development Commissioner, Small Scale Industries New Delhi.
9. Representative of the Department of Science and Technology, Government of India, New Delhi.
10. Director, Central Institute of Fisheries Technology, Cochin.
11. Representative of Director General of Supplies and Disposal, New Delhi.
12. Director, Fruits and Vegetable & Preservation, New Delhi.

का.आ. 265 .—मै. इमजीन क्रिएण्स, तिरुपुर-638607 को ई. पी. सी. जी. स्कीम के अंतर्गत संलग्न सूची के अनुसार सीप के आयात के लिए रुपए 8,08,527/- (रुपये आठ लाख आठ हजार पांच सौ सत्ताइस) का एक आयात लाइसेंस सं. पी/सीजी/2101164 दिनांक 9-11-92 जारी किया गया था।

फर्म ने उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस की सीमाशुल्क और विनिमय नियंत्रण की अनुमति इस आधार पर जारी करने का आवेदन किया है कि उक्त लाइसेंस की मूल सीमाशुल्क और विनिमय प्रतियां खो गई हैं या ग़ुम हो गई हैं। यह भी कहा गया है कि लाइसेंस की सीमाशुल्क और विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रतियां किसी सीमाशुल्क प्राधिकारी के पास पंजीकृत नहीं करवाई गई थी और इस प्रकार सीमाशुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति के मूल्य का विलुक्त भी उपयोग नहीं किया गया है।

2. अपने तर्कों के समर्थन में आइरोसधारी ने नोटरोपलिक तिरुपुर के समक्ष विधिवत अपने पक्ष पर स्टाम्प पेपर पर एक हस्ताक्षरित दस्तावेज जमा किया है। उपर्युक्त में संयुक्त है कि फर्म ने आयात लाइसेंस संख्या पी/सीजी/2101164 दिनांक 9-11-92 की मूल सीमाशुल्क और विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रतियां खो गई या ग़ुम हो गई हैं। यथासंगोचित आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश, 1985 की उपधारा 9(ग) के अंतर्गत प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए मैजिस्ट्रेट इमजीन क्रिएण्स तिरुपुर को जारी की गई उक्त मूल सीमाशुल्क और विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रतियां सं. पी/सीजी/2101164 दिनांक 9-11-92 को पुनर्प्राप्त निरस्त किया जाता है।

3. पार्टी को सीमाशुल्क और विनियम नियंत्रण प्रयोजन प्रति की दूसरी प्रति अलग से जारी की जा रही है।

[फा. सं. 18/एम 93/948/ईपीसीजी-2/1159]

माया डे. कैम, उप मुख्य नियंत्रक आयात-निर्यात

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF CONTROLLER OF IMPORTS & EXPORTS

ORDER

New Delhi, the 20th January, 1993

S.O. 265.—M/s. Imagen Creations, Tirupur-638607 were granted an import licence No. P/CG/2101164 dated 9-11-92 for Rs. 8,08,527- (Rupees Eight lakhs eight thousand five Hundred and twenty seven) import of C4 as per list enclosed under EPCG Scheme.

The firm has applied for issue of Duplicate copies of Customs and Exchange Control purpose of the above mentioned licence on the ground that the original Customs and Exchange control copies of the licence has been lost or misplaced. It has further been stated that the Customs and Exchange control copies of the licence were not registered with any Customs Authority and as such the value of Customs purpose copy has not been utilised at all.

2. In support of their contention, the licensee has filed an affidavit on stamped paper duly sworn in before a Notary Public Tirupur. I am accordingly satisfied that the original Customs and Exchange control purpose copies of Import licence No. P/CG/2101164 dt. 9-11-92 has been lost or misplaced by the firm. In exercise of the powers conferred under sub-clause 9(cc) of the Import (Control) Order, 1955 dt. 7-12-1955 as amended, the said original Customs and Exchange Control purpose copy No. P/CG/2101164 dated 9-11-92 issued to M/s. Imagen Creations, Tirupur is hereby cancelled.

3. The duplicate Customs and Exchange Control purpose copies of the said licence is being issued to the party separately.

[F. No. 18/AM-93/948/EPCG-II/1159]

MAYA D. KEM, Dy. Chief Controller of Imp. & Exp.

(महानिदेशक, विदेश व्यापार का कार्यालय)

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 22 जनवरी, 1993

का. घा. 266.—मै. मद्रास विश्वविद्यालय, मद्रास-600005 को जीसीए के अंतर्गत संलग्न सूची के अनुसार उपस्करों के आयात के लिए रुपये 5607,704 (रुपये छप्पन लाख सात हजार सात सौ चार) का सीसीपी सं. पी/जे 3109396 दिनांक 5-10-92 जारी किया गया था।

फर्म ने उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस की सीमाशुल्क और विनियम नियंत्रण की अनुलिपि इस आधार पर जारी करने का आवेदन किया है कि उक्त लाइसेंस की मूल सीमाशुल्क और नियंत्रण प्रतियां खो गईं या गुम हो गई हैं। आगे यह भी कहा गया है कि लाइसेंस की सीमाशुल्क और विनियम नियंत्रण प्रतियां किसी सीमाशुल्क प्राधिकारी के पास पंजीकृत नहीं करवाई गई थीं और इस प्रकार सीमाशुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति के मूल्य का बिल्कुल भी उपयोग नहीं किया गया है।

2. अपने तर्क के समर्थन में फर्म ने नोटरी पब्लिक मद्रास के समक्ष विधिवत् शपथ लेकर स्टाम्प पेपर पर एक हलफ-नामा दाखिल किया है। तबनुसार मैं संतुष्ट हूं कि फर्म से

सीसीपी संख्या पी/जे/3109396, दिनांक 5-10-92 को मूल सीमाशुल्क और विनियम नियंत्रण प्रयोजन प्रति खो गईं या गुम हो गई हैं। यथा संशोधित आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश, 1955 की उपधारा 9(ग) के अंतर्गत प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, मैसर्स मद्रास विश्वविद्यालय को जारी की गई उक्त मूल सीमाशुल्क और विनियम नियंत्रण प्रयोजन प्रति सं. पी/जे/3109396, दिनांक 5-10-92 को एतद्वारा निरस्त किया जाता है।

3. पार्टी को सीमाशुल्क निकासी परमिट की अनुलिपि अलग से जारी की जा रही है।

[फा. सं. एसपीएल/एनएस. 6/390/डीजीटीडी/एम93/

एसएलएस/570]

माया डे. कैम, उप मुख्य नियंत्रक, आयात-निर्यात

(Directorate General of Foreign Trade)

ORDER

New Delhi, the 22nd January, 1993

S.O. 266.—M/s. University of Madras, Madras-600005, were granted CCP No. P/J/3109396 dt. 5-10-92 for Rs. 56,07,704/- (Rupees Fifty six lakhs seven thousand seven hundred and four only) for import of Equipments as per list attached under GCA.

The firm has applied for issue of Duplicate copy of the above mentioned Customs clearance permit on the ground that the original Customs clearance permit has been lost or misplaced. It has further been stated that the Customs clearance permit was not registered with any Customs Authority and as such the value of Customs clearance permit has not been utilised at all.

2. In support of their contention, the Firm has filed an affidavit on stamped paper duly sworn in before a Notary Public, Madras. I am accordingly satisfied that the Customs clearance permit No. P/J/3109396 dt. 5-10-92 has been lost or misplaced by the firm. In exercise of the powers conferred under sub-clause 9(cc) of the Import (Control) Order, 1955 dt. 7-12-1955 as amended the said original Customs clearance permit No. P/J/3109396 dt. 5-10-92 issued to M/s. University of Madras, is hereby cancelled.

3. A duplicate Customs clearance permit is being issued to the party separately.

[F. No. SPL/NS. 6/390/DGTD/AM. 93/SLS/570]

MAYA D. KEM.

Dy. Chief Controller of Imports and Exports.

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 22 जनवरी, 1993

का. घा. 267.—मैसर्स श्री रायलासीमा अलकलोज एंड एलाइड कैमिकल्स लि., करनूल को भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक के मार्गदर्शी सिद्धांतों के अनुसार—इलेक्ट्रोनिक्स कंपोनेंट्स के आयात के लिये रुपये 5,30,10,073/- (पांच करोड़ तीस लाख, दस हजार और तिहत्तर रुपये मात्र) का आयात लाइसेंस सं. पी सीजी/2128107 दिनांक 6-6-1991 दिया गया था।

मूल आयात लाइसेंस (दोनों प्रतियां) इस कार्यालय में खो गई हैं। मैं संतुष्ट हूं कि मूल आयात लाइसेंस सं. पी

सीजी/2128107 दिनांक 6-6-1991 इस कार्यालय में गुम हो गया है। अतः यथासंशोधित आयात (निबंधन) आवेदन, 1955 दिनांक 7-12-1955 की उपधारा 9(गग) के अंतर्गत प्रवृत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए मैसर्स श्री रायलासीमा अल्कलीज एंड एलाइड कैमिकल्स लि. को जारी किया गया उक्त मूल आयात लाइसेंस (दोनों प्रतियां) सं. पी/सीजी/2128107 दिनांक 6-6-1991 एतद्वारा रद्द किया जाता है।

3. पार्टी को आयात लाइसेंस की विनियम और सीमा-शुल्क दोनों प्रतियों की अनुलिपि प्रलग से जारी की जा रही है।

[सं. सीजी-3/148/19/91-92/809]

श्रीमती रीता माथुर, उप मुख्य नियंत्रक, आयात-निर्यात

ORDER

New Delhi, the 22nd January, 1993

S.O. 267.—M/s. Sree Rayalaseema Alkalies and Allied Chemicals Ltd. Kurnool were granted Import Licence No. P/CG/2128107 dated 6-6-1991 for Rs. 5,30,10,073/- (Rupees Five crore thirty lakhs Ten thousand & Seventy three only) for import of Electrolyses Components, against Reserve Bank of India Guidelines.

2. The original Import Licence (both copies) has been misplaced in this office. I am satisfied that the original Import Licence No. P/CG/2128107 dated 6-6-1991 has been misplaced in this office. In exercise of the powers conferred under Sub-clause 9(CC) of the Import (Control) Order, 1955 dated 7-12-1955 as amended the said original Import Licence (both copies) No. P/CG/2128107 dated 6-6-1991 issued to Sree Rayalaseema Alkalies & Allied Chemicals Ltd., is hereby cancelled.

3. A duplicate Import Licence copy of the Exchange and custom copy is being issued to the party separately.

[No. CG III/148/19/91-92/809]

Smt. RITA MATUR, Dy. Chief Controller
of Imports & Exports

नागरिक प्रति, उपभोक्ता मामले और सार्वजनिक वितरण तंत्राध्य

भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो

नई दिल्ली, 30 दिसम्बर, 1992

का. आ 268.—भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो (प्रमाणन) विनियम, 1985 के उपविधाय (5) के अनुसरण में भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो एतद्वारा अधिसूचित करता है कि जिन लाइसेंसों के विवरण नीचे अनुसूची में दिए गए हैं, वे रद्दीकृत कर दिए गए हैं:

अनुसूची

क्रम संख्या	लाइसेंस संख्या	वैधता की अवधि	लाइसेंसधारी का नाम और पता	लाइसेंस के अधीन वस्तु प्रक्रिया और संबंध भारतीय यन्त्रांक की संख्या
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
क्र. सं.	सं. सीएम/एल सं.	लागू होने की तारीख	लाइसेंसधारी का नाम	वस्तु/प्रक्रम
IS : सं./भाग				
1. 2381957	92-07-16	के. बी. इंडस्ट्रीज (इंडिया), जी. टी. रोड, चंदला मार्केट खजुरा (पंजाब) 141001	इस्पात के कच्चे साइज : 75 मिमी. से 100 मिमी तक और 125 मि.मी (मध्यम भार)	IS : 01341 : 81
2. 2382050	92-07-16	पार्थ पम्पस प्रा. लि., 338/2बी, मितारा रोड, कालापट्टी, कोयम्बतूर-641035	एक फीजी छोटे एसी पंखा इयूटी, 0.18 किवा 240 वा. श्रेणी बी रोडन सहित, संवारित स्टार्ट रन टाइम	IS : 00996 : 79
3. 2382151	92-07-16	रोहतास इंडस्ट्रीज (सीमेंट इंडियन) बालमिया नगर, जि-रोहतास (बिहार) 821305	33 ग्रेड क्षात्राण पोर्टलैंड सीमेंट	IS : 00269 : 89
4. 2382282	92-07-16	श्री सेमिनेटर्स, 103/20 फोर गोर रोड, शिवपुर, हावड़ा	उर्वरक पैकिंग हेतु 380 ग्राम/मी ² 68×28 टारपुलिन कपड़े से उत्पादित पट- सन के कट्टे	IS : 07406 : 86 भाग : 02
5. 2382353	92-07-16	श्री सेमिनेटर्स, 103/20 फोर गोर रोड, शिवपुर, हावड़ा	उर्वरक पैकिंग हेतु 470 ग्राम/मी ² 85×39 टारपुलिन कपड़े से उत्पादित पटसन के कट्टे	IS : 07406 : 84 भाग : 01
6. 2382454	92-07-16	बम्बई प्रा इंडियल प्रॉडक्ट्स (इंडिया), 6 इंड., एस्टेट, पोलोब्राउंड, इंदौर (म.प्र.) 452003	क्लोरीन की गोलियां	IS : 09825 : 01

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
7. 2382555	92-07-16	जैन कौमीकल्स, 767, इंड एस्टेट, फेज 11, चंडीगढ़	अभिमानार्थ पाउडर, टाइप 3 केवल	IS : 08047 : 20	IE: स./भाग
8. 2382656	92-07-16	कुणाल ब्रवर्स प्रा. लि., ए-7 मंगोलपुरी एंड. एरिया-110083	1100 बो तक कार्यकारी बोल्डता के लिए पीवीसी रोहित केवल, बिना खोल वाले एल्यू मीनियम बालकों पीवीसी रोहित केवल	IS : 00694 : 77	
9. 2382757	92-07-16	रामक्री इंस्ट्रूज (इंडिया), 56-ए, सफुलर रोड, (जवाला नगर चौक) शाहपुरा-110032	1100 बो तक कार्यकारी बोल्डता के लिए पीवीसी रोहित केवल, बिना खोल वाले एल्यू मीनियम बालकों वाली पीवीसी रोहित केवल	IS : 00694 : 77	
10. 2382858	92-07-16	बुर्गा इंजीनियरिंग कं., 22/2 वेमप्राण, ससमल रोड, हावड़ा-711101	स्विच चक टाइप रिफ्लेक्स बालब साइज : 300 मिमी तक	IS : 05312 : 84	भाग : 01
11. 2382959	92-07-16	हिंद वायर इंस्ट्रूज लि., इकफोर्ड रोड, सकुचार, 24 परगना (प. ब.)	पूर्व प्रतिक्रित अक्षेपित प्रतिबल मुक्त लड़, 3 ग्राई, 3 मिमी साइज तक	IS : 06006 : 83	
12. 2383052	92-07-16	अमरनाथ कौमीकल कं., वर्षिण वनसरहि डा.--वसंतरहि (प. ब.) 711106	सासाय प्रयोजन के लिए कॉटिंग तेल विलेय केवल	IS : 01115 : 86	
13. 2383153	92-07-16	कायमंड केमीकल इंस्ट्रूज, एफ-22 पतकी इंड. एरिया, साइट-11 कानपुर	रोगाणुनाशी ब्रव, काला, थ्रेणी "ए" टाइप-डामाय्य ग्रेड 3 केवल	IS : 01061 : 82	
14. 2383254	92-07-16	मेशनल सीमेंट कारपोरेशन, इंड एरिया, तिका, जिला-नगपुर (म.प्र.)	पोर्टलैंड धीनुमल सीमेंट	IS : 00455 : 89	
15. 2383355	जं. एम.	जं. एम. टी. इंड. कारपोरेशन, बी-170, चौथा मेन रोड	तंगस्टन तंतु वाले सामान्य सेवा बिली के बल्ब, 15 वा से 100वा, 230व	IS : 00418 : 78	
16. 2383456	92-07-36	श्री स्वाम उद्योग, इंड. एरिया, डा.--वेरुन औरंगाबाद (विहार)	वनस्पति और खाद्य तेलों के पैकिंग के लिए 15 किश. के कनस्तर	IS : 10325 : 89	
17. 2383557	92-07-16	कृष्ण हैदराबाद लाइम्स प्रा. लि., प्रा. एच. डा. सिधरथ, जि.--सिरोही (राज) 307001	33 ग्रेड माधारण पोर्टलैंड सीमेंट	IS : 00269 : 89	
18. 2383658	92-07-16	लक्ष्मी पेंट इंस्ट्रूज, जी टी रोड, माया सिनेमा, पेक्षाता, अमृतसर	स्टिम्पर तेल इमल्शन ग्रेड हल्का पीला क्रीम केवल	IS : 00428 : 69	
19. 2383759	92-07-16	वाशेय केबल्स प्रा. लि., ए-2/3 एम.प्राईडीसी, कमलेश्वर जि.--नागौर	शिरोपरि प्रेदन के लिए जस्तीकृत इस्पात प्रबलित एल्यूमीनियम बालक	IS : 00398 : 76	भाग : 02
20. 2383860	92-07-16	डी आर एम स्टील इंस्ट्रूज प्रा. लि. मुरबाद रोड, उत्कृष्ट नगर, जि.--ठाणे-421001	संरचना इस्पात (मानक किस्म), 5 ए, 250 बो.	IS : 00226 : 75	

1	2	3	4	5	6
21. 2383961	92-07-16	मार्शन प्रॉडक्ट्स, कशावका कपाउण्ड, आई. बी. पटेल रोड गोरेगांव, पो. बा. नं. 9075, बम्बई-400063	सीलिंग रोजेज, 5 ए, 250 बो, 63.5 मिमी साइज सतह टाइप	IS : 00371 : 79	
22. 2384054	92-07-16	देवी पेस्टीसाइड्स, क्र. सं. 737/5 सर्वगाम पट्टी, बेटलिंगुडु, निबलाकोट्टाई ताल्लुक, जि.—मदुरै—(तमि.) 624203	क्लोरोपाइरोफॉस 22% (ब/प्र) ईसी फार्मूलेशन केवल	IS : 08944 : 78	
23. 2384153	92-07-16	देवी पेस्टीसाइड्स, क्र. सं. 737/5 सर्वगाम पट्टी, बेटलिंगुडु, निबलाकोट्टाई ताल्लुक, जि.—मदुरै—(तमि.) 624202	मोनोक्रोटोफॉस 36% (ब/प्र) एसएस फार्मूलेशन केवल	IS : 08074 : 90	
24. 2384256	92-07-01	कोटुमल संस आयन प्रा. लि., 153 एम. बी. एस मार्ग, बंधप, बम्बई-400078	जलसक्ति	IS : 10633 : 86	
25. 2384357	92-07-16	मिन्नल ब्रदर्स, प्लाट नं. 202 (जी), अजमेर रोड, सोबला, जयपुर-302008	जल सतृ बनाने के लिए सीमेंट में मिलाया जाने वाला योजिक (पूर्ण क्षाण टाइप)	IS : 02645 : 75	
26. 2384458	92-07-16	अग्रवाल राजस्वरोलिंग मिल्स लि., जी. ई. रोड, तालांभव, रायपुर (म. प्र.)	रेलवेनीय संरचना इस्पात ग्रेड : 410 डबलए	IS : 02062 : 84	
27. 2384559	92-07-16	मिलार्ई स्ट्रक्चरलस, 29 - बी, इंड. एस्टेट, मिलार्ई (म. प्र.) 490026	एच एस डी सरिण ग्रेड 415 साइज : 8 मिमी में 20 मिमी तक	IS : 01786 : 85	
28. 2384660	92-07-16	हिन्द पम्पस लि., तट्टमाल गिफोहाबाद, जि - फिरोजाबाद (उ. प्र.)	सामान्य प्रकाश सेवा हेतु नलिकाकार फ्लूरोसेन्ट लैम्प, 40वा, 6500 ब्रिचो कैल्ब	IS : 02418 : 77	भाग : 01
29. 2384761	92-07-16	वाटर वाल्व वसे, बस्ती भावाडेल, कपूरथला, जालंधर	तांबा मिश्रधातु के गेट, श्रेणी 1, फॉस सिरे इंडीगरल थॉई सोट, वोल्ट में कसे तानराइजिंग स्टेम, ठोस बैज, साइज : 15 मिमी से 50 मिमी तक	IS : 00778 : 84	
30. 2384862	92-07-16	कैनी उद्योग (रजि.) के. एच. - 86, पहनादपुर, बधाना रोड, दिल्ली - 110042	रोमाणगानी काला श्रेणी "ए" टाइप - सामान्य, ग्रेड 3 केवल	IS : 01061 : 82	
31. 2384963	92-07-16	नरसिंह इलेक्ट्रिकल इंडस्ट्रीज, 27/13/2 आ. एवं धा बाइली, दिल्ली - 110042	1100 बो तक कार्यकारी बोल्ट के लिए एल्यूमीनियम और तांबा जामकी वाली पी वी सी रोहित केवल	IS : 00694 : 77	
32. 2385056	92-07-16	पेस्टोक्रैम इंडिया, 320 कलासल नगर, दिल्ली - 110094	मेथाथियाम 25% (ब/प्र) डबलू डी पी सी फार्मूलेशन केवल	IS : 02509 : 78	
33. 2385157	92-07-16	बाल्टन इंडस्ट्रीज, 103 - ए, शिवकामी काचोनी, गणपति, कोयंबळूर	एक केजी छोटे एसी बिजली के मोटर, 240 बो, 0.37 किवा रेटिंग और श्रेणी बी रोशन सहित सघातक स्टार्ट और रन टाइप	IS : 06996 : 79	
34. 2385258	92-07-12	श्री बालाजी केवल इंडस्ट्रीज, इंड एस्टेट, बैलरी रोड, धन्वतपुर - 515004	शिरोपरि प्रेषण के लिए अस्तिष्ठत इस्पात प्रवर्तित एल्यूमीनियम सामक	IS : 00398 : 76	भाग : 02

1	2	3	4	5	6
35. 2385359	92-07-16	विजया कौमोक्तम, सबै नं. 61, गानापञ्चम प्रा. मन्त्रालय 600116	गैलादियान 5% (द्र/द्र) ई सी फार्मूलेसन केवल	IS : 02567 : 78	
36. 2385460	92-07-16	सर हजा. प्रा. लि. सा-1/बी-225, जी आई सी एस्टेट जिला-बहीदरा-391760	शिरोपरि प्रेषण प्रयोजना के लिए जस्ती- कृत इस्पात प्रयोजित एल्यूमीनियम चालक	IS : 00398 : 76 भाग : 02	
37. 2385561	92-07-16	जैन कौमोक्तम, 767 फेज 2, इंड. एरिया, बंई. गढ़	रोगाणुनाशक द्रव, काला, श्रेणी "ए" टाइप सामान्य और ग्रेड 3	IS : 01061 : 82	
38. 2385662	92-07-16	गुजरात पैरटासाइड्स, एफ-15, जी आई सी एस्टेट, नारोडा, फेज 2, नैक टाइम्स के पीछे, माइन रोड, भद्रमदाबाद-382330	मोनोकोटोफॉस 36% (द्र/द्र) एसएल फार्मू- लेशन केवल	IS : 08074 : 90	
39. 2385763	92-07-16	कौमोक्तम इंडस्ट्रीज, के.एम.पी. बिल्डिंग, 37 मोहम्मद रोशर स्ट्रीट, हार्जिपेट कोयम्बतूर-641001	एक फेज छोटे एस. बिजली के मोटर 9.55 किवा, 240 वोल्ट, श्रेणी बी रोशन सहित सघारित स्टार्ट और रन टाइप	IS : 00996 : 79	
40. 2385864	92-07-16	डेक्स एक ट्रेड्स 71 साधल स्ट्रीट नं. 4, के.भारपुरम, कोयम्बतूर-641000	एक फेज छोटे एस. बिजली के मोटर 0.75 किवा, 240 वोल्ट, श्रेणी बी रोशन सहित, सघारित स्टार्ट और रन टाइप	IS : 00996 : 79	
41. 2385965	92-07-16	एस.के.सामेंट पाइप कं. प्रा. लि. प्लॉट नं. 58, इंड. एरिया, फेज 1, पंचकुला, जिला-शम्भाला (हरियाणा)	मेनहोल के बकन, गड्य और ह्यूडी ब्यूटी ग्रेड	IS : 12592 : 88 भाग : 01	
42. 2386058	92-07-16	एस एन ईमाकल्स इंडस्ट्रीज, तार्दगांव रोड, पुराना फरीदाबाद, (हरियाणा)	कॉपर आक्साइडोइड, 50% (द्र/द्र) इन्फ्यूडी पी साइ फार्मूलेसन केवल	IS : 01507 : 77	
43. 2386159	92-07-16	गोन्डारी इंडस्ट्रीज लि., तोपन्सी तहसील-बेलाचार जिला-बीकानेरपुर	इन्फ्यूडी पी साइ फार्मूलेसन केवल	IS : 9353 : 80	
44. 2386260	92-07-16	मारुति पिस्टन प्रा. लि. समोआईवी-25/3, जीआईसीसी एस्टेट, कनोल, गुजरात-382725	आई सी इंजन के लिए एल्यूमीनियम मिश्र धातु के पिस्टन, व्यास रेंज 50 मिमी से 85 मिमी तक	IS : 08503 : 86	
45. 2386361	92-07-16	वि.कन्या कुमार जिला कॉर्पोरेटिव मिनिंग मिल लि., अरावली मोबाइल जिला-कन्या कुमारी-629006	गुप्त और रुई के पुरातन सेल्युलोजिय रेजा मिश्रित कोर धागा पीएल ग्रेड काट्ट	IS : 00172 : 85	
46. 2386462	92-07-16	धर्माक कंक्रीट ग्रेड एसएल इंडस्ट्रीज प्रा. लि. पनपतेश्वर, कन्यापुर, आसनसेन (प. ब.)	पाईपिंग धातुमल कोरेंट	IS : 00455 : 89	
47. 2386563	92-07-16	मोटर केवल कारपोरेशन 10/169/6 कटरा साहू पंडित, माधन वस्ता इंड. एरिया, नई दिल्ली-110005	1100 वोल्ट तक कार्पासरी कोरेंट के लिए पीवीसी रोडिंग, प्रयोजित और कवचित एल्यूमीनियम और तांबा चालकों वाली पीवीसी रोडिंग (ह्यूडी ब्यूटी) बिजली की केबल	IS : 01554 : 88 भाग : 01	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
48. 2386664	92-07-16	गिवम डोमेस्टिक एप्लाइड इन्फ्यू-3-ए नारायणा ग्राम, दिल्ली-110028	द्र. प्रे. गै. के माथ प्रमुक्त लुहें, सोआई बर्नर दो, निकिल क्रोमियम लेपित और स्टेनलैस इस्पात के टेपर फंटे का टोना	IS: 04246: 84	
49. 2386765	92-07-16	कैपिटल ट्रेडर्स, ए-6, स्ट्रीट नं. 4, बंड. एरिया, भानंद पर्वत, नई दिल्ली-110005	एक फंजी छोटे एस. पंखा मोटर, 230 वी, थ्रॉपी ई रोयल सहित, 118 लक ग्रेडिड टुव टाएष और 105वी, 123वा और 147वा संघारिख स्टार्ट और एन टाएष सल्लेड अतिरिधो सोमेंट	IS: 00996: 79	
50. 2386866	92-07-16	हीरा इंडस्ट्रीज लि., ग्राम-पंडितवारी, श्रीराम रोड, जबलपुर		IS: 12330: 88	
51. 2386967	92-07-16	फ्लावाट कंडक्टर्स, 320 किमी का परवर, जी टी रोड, पियाओ मनिपारो कुंडली, सोनीपत हरियाणा 131028	शिरोपरि प्रेषण हेतु जस्तीकृत इस्पात प्रबलित एल्युमिनियम आलक	IS: 00398: 76 भाग: 02	
52. 2387060	92-07-16	लामाभी मोटर्स एंड इलेक्ट्रिकल्स (इंडिया) प्रा. लि., घाटकु गंधी, (हि. प्र.)	एसी बिजली के गिटर	IS: 60722: 77	
53. 2387161	92-08-01	सुप्रीम मेटप्रोडक्ट्स प्रा. लि., जी-85/14 एन 14, बा. के. आई. एरिया, जयपुर-302103	शिरोपरि प्रेषण के लिए जस्तीकृत इस्पात प्रबलित एल्युमिनियम आलक के श्रोड हेतु जस्तीकृत इस्पात तार	IS: 00398: 76 भाग: 02	
54. 2387262	92-08-01	लोधी कैलिथियम प्राइवट्स प्रा. लि., उगानिगुडला गा., धीन गंजल, बिला-कुरुनूल (आ. प्र.)	33 ग्रेड साधारण पोर्टेबेलैड सोमेंट	IS: 01269: 89	
55. 2387363	92-08-01	काकतिया सीमेंट लि., श्रीनिवास नगर, जगयापेटा, जिला-कृष्णा, (आ. प्र.)	43 ग्रेड साधारण पोर्टेबेलैड सोमेंट	IS: 08112: 89	
56. 2387464	92-02-01	मान एल्यूमीनियम लि., प्लाट नं. 67/ए, बंड. एरिया, धौलपुर, जिला-घाँस (म. प्र.)	मिचआई प्रयोजनों के लिए एल्यूमीनियम के पाएष	IS: 07092: 76 भाग: 02	
57. 2387565	92-08-01	भारत कंडक्टर्स प्रा. लि., 116 दूराय स्टेज, तीसरा फेज, पोतवा इंड. एस्टेट, बंगलौर-560058	अन्याधिक उच्च वोल्टता (400 किवा और अधिक) के लिए जस्तीकृत इस्पात प्रबलित एल्युमिनियम आलक	IS: 00398: 82 भाग: 05	
58. 2387666	92-08-01	योनस इलेक्ट्रिकल एप्लाइड्स, 16/250, ब्लाक 1, रोड नं. 3, बापा नगर, करोल बाग, नई दिल्ली-11005	बिजली की इस्तरों, पापधारी सहित, 750 वा, 230 वी, वी वोल्टेजो तल- प्लेट सहित	IS: 00356: 85	
59. 2387767	92-08-01	एन.पी. इलेक्ट्रिकल्स, ए-60-ए गली नं. 02, मिथुन गार्डन, नई दिल्ली-110318	एक फंजी छोटे एसी पंखे इन्वर्टी मोटर	IS: 00996: 79	
60. 2387868	92-08-01	कैवकान प्राइवट्स, जी-63, सेक्टर-6, मोण्डा, (उ. प्र.) 291301	प्रचालन द्वारा नियंत्रित दोर यंत्रोपर	IS: 03564: 88	
61. 2387969	92-08-01	धार.एस. इंडस्ट्रीज, (रजि. निरत) लि., (ए-241-242 (बी), रोड नं. 8-डी, बी.के.आई क्षेत्र, जयपुर-302013	मंगलता इस्पात (उच्च गुणवत्ता)	IS: 00061: 75	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
62. 2388062	92-08-01	बदा आयरन एंड स्टील वर्क्स प्रा. लि., जी. ई. रोड, कुम्हारो, जिला दुर्ग, (म.प्र.)-490043	वेल्लनोथ संरचना इस्पात, ग्रेड : 410 इन्स्यू ए	IS 02082 : 84	
63. 2388163	92-08-01	गैलियम स्टील प्राइवेट्स, 337, शिव शक्ति नगर, शिव मंदिर के पास, मेरठ शहर (उ.प्र.)-250002	धातुबन्धन के लोहे के पाइप फिटिंग	IS 01879 : 87	
64. 2388364	92-08-01	राजिन्द्र स्टील्स लि., 23 बां कि. का पथर, रा-चिरोरा, रनिया-कानपुर जिला	नैसर्ग पाइप	IS 10577 : 82	
65. 2388365	92-08-01	राजिन्द्र स्टील्स लि., 23वां किमी. का पथर, रा. चिरोरा, रनिया-कानपुर जिला	विद्युत सेलिंग इस्पात पाईप ईमारतबन्धू, ग्रेड 330 काला सादा सिले, बाहरी व्यास 108.3 मिमी तक	IS 03589 : 81	
66. 2388466	92-08-01	राजिन्द्र स्टील्स लि. 23 बां किमी. का पथर, रा. चिरोरा, रनिया-कानपुर जिला	यांत्रिक और सामान्य प्रयोजनों के लिए इस्पात के पाइप, ईमारतबन्धू, ग्रेड इन्स्यू टी 160	IS 03601 : 84	
67. 2388567	92-08-01	संता इंडस्ट्रिज, 480-ए, अविनाशी रोड, पोलामेडु, कोयम्बतूर-641094	एक फेजी छोटी एसो विजली के मोटर	IS 90998 : 79	
68. 2388668	92-08-01	श्री घनलक्ष्मी फाउन्ड्री, 1452-ए, साठे रोड, (सीएमएस स्कूल के पास) गणपति, कोयम्बतूर-641004	कृषि कार्यों के लिए मोनोसेट पम्प	IS 09979 : 89	
69. 2388769	92-08-01	राजहंस मिरोमिक्स इंड., नवीगाव (रमनवीर) तालुक-कोटावा. जिला-सुरेन्द्र नगर	लवण से ग्रेज किए स्टेनलेस स्टील, मैक "ए" साइज : 100 और 150 मिमी	IS 00651 : 90	
70. 2388870	92-08-01	शिवम प्रस्प एंड इंजीनियरिंग कारपोरेशन., रोड, देवसर, बिलीगोरिया, जिला-वलसाड. (गुजरात)-396989	निमज्ज्य पम्पसेट, माडल एसएन 53	IS 08034 : 89	
71. 2388971	92-08-01	चारमेक्स प्राइवेट्स, यूनिट नं. 26, दूसरा तल, जे. के. इंड. एस्टेट, लिफ्टिंग रोड, एक्सप्रे, सांताक्रुज (पश्चिम), बम्बई-40054	सीमिंग रोजेज, 5 ए, 230 बी, ए सी केबल	IS : 00371 : 79	
72. 2389064	92-08-01	अरुण पाइप लि., एफ-78, 82, सिपकोट इंड. काम्प्लेक्स, गुम्मीडी पोन्डी 601202	एम एस पाइप, ई मार इन्स्यू, काला, 50 मिमी, एन बी, हल्की शेणी, वाई एस टी 210	IS : 01161 : 79	
73. 2389165	92-08-01	अशोक केबल्स, मनीपुर, तालुक बायारा, एस एच नं. 66, जिला सुरत (गुजरात)	शिरोपरि प्रेषण के लिए एल्यूमीनियम के लड़दार आधक	IS : 00398 : 76	
74. 2389266	92-08-01	अशोक केबल्स, मनीपुर तालुक-बायारा, एस एच नं. 66, जि. सुरत (गुजरात)	शिरोपरि प्रेषण के लिए एल्यूमीनियम के आधक	IS : 00398 : 76 भाग : 2	
75. 2389367	92-08-01	एल एम एम इंटरनेशनल, हाथड़ा-ग्रामदे रोड, बांकुरा, हाथड़ा-711103	1.6 टन उत्पादक क्षमता वाला हस्त चालित यूनिवर्सल गीयरलेस, पुलिय और लिफ्टिंग मशीन	IS : 05604 : 84	
76. 2389468	92-08-01	प्रिवीजन्स इंजीनियरिंग वर्क्स, 51-ए से जेड, एंड. एस्टेट, फुर्कूसन रोड, लोअर पारेल, बम्बई-400013	कृषि प्रयोजनों हेतु अपकेन्ट्री पम्प हेतु नॉन फेज स्विचरिस पिजरी प्रेरण मोटर	IS : 07538 : 75	
77. 2389567	92-08-01	इस्टर्न बर्ड, बी/28 ग्लू इंड. एस्टेट, जगतपुर, कटक-754021	अलोह धातु (एल्यूमीनियम मिश्रधातु) के टायर काबले-टाइप 4 (बीरल टाइप)	IS : 00204 : 78	

1	2	3	4	5	6
78. 2399670	92-08-01	ईस्टन वडै, बै/78 न्यू इंड. एस्टेट, जगतपुर, कटक 754021	बस्ताजे के लिए श्रालोड धातु (एल्यूमीनियम मिश्रधातु) के खिसकने वाले कामले (एल्यूफ)	IS 02681 : 77	
79. 2399771	92-08-01	वी.एफ इंडस्ट्रीज, बॉ-150, सेक्टर 6, नोएडा (उ.प्र.) 201 301	इस्पात के कब्जे, साइज 75 मिमी, भारी	IS 0334 : 85	
80. 2399872	92-08-01	प्रचंता स्टील लि., 3, ई.ए. एरिया, चंडीगढ़ 160002	एच एस डी सरिए, ग्रेड 415 साइज 8 से 25 मिमी	IS 01786 : 85	
81. 2389973	92-08-01	लक्ष्मी स्टील रोलिंग मिल, पो. बा. नं. 85, जी टो रोड, पावर हाउस के सामने, खारा	जेलडनीय संरचना इस्पात, ग्रेड 410, इन्व्यू ए, गोल सरिए, साइज : 40 मिमी व्यास तक	IS 02063 : 84	
82. 2390049	92-08-01	राजित्वर स्टील लि., 23वां कि मी का पत्थर, धाम बिरौरा, रमिया, कालपुर देहात	पट्टा कनवेयर के ग्राइडर हेतु इस्पात के पाइप	IS 09395 : 83	
83. 2390150	92-08-01	इंडोटेक इंजीनियर्स, 13-ए, मोहकमपुर इंड. कॉम्प्लेक्स, विल्मि-मेरठ रोड, मेरठ	भस्म बाबू बणीय गैसों के लिए वेल्डित, भस्म कार्बन इस्पात के गैस सिलिन्डर 2. 4 और 4 मिटर जल धारिता वाले	IS 07142 : 74	
84. 2390851	92-08-01	स्टैंडर्ड इंडस्ट्रीज, 1/6, पं. रा नायडू स्ट्रीट, पी एन पलायम, कोयम्बटूर 641037	एक फेज छोटे ए सी बिजली के मोटर 240 बी, संवारित स्टार्ट और रन टाइप	IS 00996 : 79	
85. 2390352	92-08-01	गुजरात राइफिल्स लि., 387, जी आई डी सी कवोया, जिला बड़ौदा 391760 (गुजरात)	प्रेषण रोलर की इस्पात की जंजीर पदनाम 081-1	IS 02403 : 75	
86. 2390453	92-08-01	बाली केमीकल्स, 3107 इंड. एरिया-2, रामवरवार, चंडीगढ़-160002	रोगाणुनाशी द्रव, काला, टाइप सामान्य, श्रेणी "ए" ग्रेड 3 केवल	IS : 01061 : 82	
87. 2390554	92-08-01	भारत पेस्टीसाइड्स मैनु. कं., ई-17, डी एस गार्ड डी सी इंड कॉम्प्लेक्स, रोहतक रोड, दिल्ली-110041	2, 4-डी, इथाइल ग्रेस्टर 34% (द्र/द्र) ई सी फार्मिलेशन केवल	IS 10243 : 82	
88. 2390655	92-08-01	हिन्दन प्रिमीजन् लि., 19-सी, सेक्टर-2, परवाना	इस्पात के कब्जे, मध्यम भार, 75 से 125 मिमी साइज	IS 01341 : 91	
89. 2390756	92-08-01	नार्थ ईस्टन केबल्स एंड कंडक्टर (प्रा.) लि., एफ-44 इंड. एरिया, सीकर (राजस्थान) 333001	शिरोपरि प्रेषण हेतु एल्यूमीनियम, के सड़दार कालक	IS 00398 : 76 भाग : 01	
90. 2390857	92-08-01	समीर सेस्टी इक्विपमेंट्स, बी-30 मिनर्वा इंड. एरिटेड, पो. के. रोड, सार्ई धाम विल्डिंग के पीछे, मुजफ्फर, दम्बई-400080	गुवाहटी घणितशामक, कार्बन ग्राइडर साइज टाइप	IS 02878 : 86	
91. 2390958	92-08-01	रार्ई मेटल वर्क्स, रार्ई धाम, बाया मायल्वर, जिला ठाणे (महाराष्ट्र)	एच एस डी सरिए, ग्रेड 415 साइज 8 से 25 मिमी तक	IS 01786 : 85	
92. 2391051	92-08-01	जय स्टील इंडस्ट्रीज, 383 हैरिसनज, कालपुर 208004	एच एस डी सरिए, ग्रेड 515, साइज 8 से 32 मिमी तक	IS 01786 : 85	
93. 2391152	92-08-01	हन्नोर केमीकल्स एंड फर्टिलाइजर्स (प्रा) लि, पो. जे. नं. 13, जिन्नोर एक्सप्रेस हाई रोड, हन्नोर, भद्रास-600057	कृषि ग्रेड जिक सल्फेट	IS 08249 : 76	

94. 2391253	92-08-01	गुप्ता कैमिकल्स प्रा. लि., बी-144 रोड नं. 9, बी के आई एरिया, जयपुर 302015	फास्कोमिशन 85 % (ब/प्र) इन्सुलेशन मांद्र कार्बोनेशन के रण	IS 00177 : 81
95. 2391354	92-08-01	ज्योति सीमेंट प्रा. लि., एफ-68, 70 इंड एरिया, विहगोर, जिला झारखण्ड	33 ग्रेड माधारण पोर्टलैंड सीमेंट,	IS : 00269 : 89
96. 2391455	92-08-01	गोयल कंटेनर्स प्रा. लि., 809, सेक्टर 3, पीतमपुरा, जिला धार (म.प्र.)	पेय जल आपूर्ति के लिये यू पी सी पाइप	IS 04985 : 88
97. 2391556	92-08-01	किंग स्टीलरोलिंग मिल्स, जी टी रोड (सरहिन्द साइट) मंडी गोविन्दगढ़	एच एस डी सरिय, ग्रेड 415 साइज 8 से 28 मिमी तक	IS 017801 : 85
98. 2391657	92-08-01	राठी पाइप्स एंड प्रोडक्ट्स प्रा. लि., बी 1 से जी 4 एवं जी 11 से जी 12 इंड एस्टेट, भूपैरेट, जिला तलगाँवा (आ.प्र.) पिन-508214	पेय जल आपूर्ति के लिए यू पी सी पाइप	IS 04985 : 88
99. 2391758	92-08-01	एम. के. बिनाइल (प्रा) लि., जी टी रोड इंड एरिया, चौदहापाड़ा, जिला मोहरा, जिला फतेहपुर (उ.प्र.)	पेय जल आपूर्ति के लिए यू पी सी पाइप	IS 04985 : 88
100. 2391859	92-08-01	भद्रपूर्णा स्टील्स (प्रा) लि., नारायणा नगर, बैजपुर रोड, काशीपुर, जिला नैनीताल, उ.प्र.	संरचना दस्ता में सेलन ड्रेपु डोने डिस्टेंस (माथक किस्म)	IS 03914 : 78
101. 2391960	92-08-01	टेक स्टील प्रोडक्ट्स प्रा. लि., 671 नागाबारा मेन रोड, अरेबिल कालेज पोस्ट, बंगलौर-560045	ड्रम, बड़े, जड़ित सिरे, ग्रेड बी टाइप	IS 03783 : 88 भाग : 02
102. 2392053	92-08-01	वेबीक्याल एंड सहिन्ना केबल्स (प्रा) लि., खमरा नं. 61, प्रा. एवं डा. मटियाला, नजफगढ़ रोड, नई दिल्ली-110059	1105 बी तक कार्यकारी बोल्डता के लिए पी बी सी रोडित (हैवी ड्यूटी) आच्छादित तांबा बालकों बाय केबल	IS 01554 : 88 भाग : 01
103. 2592154	92-001	टोरेन्ट केबल्स लि. (पूर्व में महेन्द्रा इलेक्ट्रिकल लि.), ग्राम कमला, मिशन रोड नाडियाड, जिला खड़ग (गुजरात) 397001	1100 बी तक कार्यकारी बोल्डता के लिए पी बी सी रोडित क्रास बंधित पॉलीइथाइलीन रोडन तथा पी बी सी का खोल बड़ों केबल	IS 07098 : 88 भाग : 01
104. 2392255	92-08-01	अरिहन्त कंडक्टर्स, भालेजी रोड, ओवर ब्रिज, आनन्द गुजरात 388001	शिरोपरि प्रेषण के लिए जस्ताकृत दस्ता प्रचलित एन्वुमीनियम बालक	IS 00398 : 76 भाग : 02
105. 2392556	92-08-01	अरिहन्त कंडक्टर्स, भालेजी रोड, ओवर ब्रिज, आनन्द (गुजरात) 388001	शिरोपरि प्रेषण के लिए एन्वुमीनियम के लड़वार बालक	IS 00398 : 76 भाग : 01
106. 2392457	92-08-01	ओनवाल इलेक्ट्रिकल कंडक्टर्स, गुलाब निवास, एम आई रोड, जयपुर-30200	शिरोपरि प्रेषण के लिए एन्वुमीनियम मिश्रधातु के लड़वार बालक (एलुमीनियम-मैग्नेशियम-सिलिकॉन टाइप)	IS 00398 : 79 भाग : 04
107. 2392558	92-08-01	प्रकाश पाइप फैक्ट्री, वास नगर गंज, प्लाक बालडोर	पूर्व डोने कंक्रीट टाइप, श्रेणी एन पी 2, एन पी 3, साइज 300 मिमी केबल (सादा सिरे)	IS 00458 : 89

[सं. के. प्र. वि./13 : 1]

एन. श्रीनिवासन, अपर महातिदेशक

MINISTRY OF CIVIL SUPPLIES CONSUMER AFFAIRS & PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION

BUREAU OF INDIAN STANDARDS

New Delhi, the 30th December, 1992

S.O. 268—In pursuance of sub-regulation (5) of the Bureau of Indian Standards (certification) Regulations, 1988, the Bureau of Indian Standards, hereby notifies the grant of licences particulars of which are given in the following schedule.

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	CM/L-No. Operative Date	Name & Address of the Party	Article/Process covered by the licence	IS : No./Part
No.	Date			
1. 2381957	92-07-16	Kay Bee Industries (India), G.T. Road, Chandla Market, Khanna (Punjab) 141001	Steel Butt Hinges of sizes 75 mm 100 mm and 125 mm (Medium Weight)	IS : 01341 : 81
2. 2382050	92-07-16	Sharp Pumps Pvt. Ltd., 330/28, Sitra Road, Kalapatti, Coimbatore-641035	Single-Phase small AC fan duty motors 0.18 KW, 240 V with class B Insulation. Capacitor start and run type	IS : 00996 : 79
3. 2382151	92-07-16	Rohtas Industries (Cement Division), Dalmianagar Distt. Rohtas (Bihar) 821305	Ordinary portland cement 33 grade	IS : 00269 : 89
4. 2382252	92-07-16	Shree Laminators, 103/20, Fore Shore Road, Shibpur, Howrah.	Jute bags for packing fertilizers laminated bags manufactured from 380G/M Sq. 68 × 39 Tarpaulin Fabric	IS : 07406 : 86 Part: 02
5. 2382353	92-07-16	Shree Laminators 103/20, Fore Shore Road, Shibpur, Howrah.	Jute bags for packing fertilizers laminated bags manufactured from 407 G/M Sq. 85 × 39 Tarpaulin Fabric.	IS : 07406 : 84 Part : 01
6. 2382454	92-07-16	Bombay Ideal Products (India), 6, Indl. Estate, Pologround, Indore (MP) 452003	Chlorine Tablets only	IS : 09825 : 81
7. 2382555	92-07-16	Jain Chemicals, 767, Indl. Area, Phase II, Chandigarh.	Scouring Powder, Type 2 only	IS : 06047 : 70
8. 2382656	92-07-16	Kunal Brothers Pvt. Ltd., A-7, Mangolpuri Indl. Area, Phase II Delhi-110083	PVC Insulated cables for working voltages upto & including 1100 V, Unsheathed with Alu minium and copper conductors	IS : 00694 : 77
9. 2382757	92-07-16	Remco Industries (India), 56-A, Circular Road, (Near Jwala Nagar Chowk) Shahdara, Delhi-110032	PVC Insulated cables for working voltages upto & including 1100V. unsheathed with Aluminium conductors	IS : 00694 : 77
10. 2382858	92-07-16	Durga Engineering Co. 22/2, Deshpriya Sasmal Road, Howrah-711101	Swing chuck type reflex (non-Return) valves of sizes upto & including 300 mm	IS : 05312 : 84 Part : 01
11. 2382959	92-07-16	Hind wire Industries Ltd., Ekeford Road, Sukchar 23 Parganas (WB)	Uncoated stress relieved strand for prestressed concrete upto & including 3 Ply 3 mm size	IS : 06006 : 83
12. 2383052	92-07-16	Amarnath Chemical Co., Dakshin buxrah, PO Buxrah Howrah (WB) 711106	General purpose cutting oil, soluble only	IS : 01115 : 86

1	2	3	4	5	6
13.	2383153	92-07-16	Diamond Chemical Industries F-53, Panki Indl. Area, Site II, Kanpur.	Disinfectant Fluid, Black, Class A, Type- Normal, Grade 3 only.	IS 01061 : 82
14.	2383254	92-07-16	National Cement Corpn, Indl. Area, Tifra, Bilaspur (MP)	Portland slag cement	IS 00455 : 89
15.	2383355	92-07-16	JMT Indl. Corporation. B-170, IV Main Road, Peenya Indl. Estate II Stage, Bangalore-560058	Tungsten filament general service electric Lamps, 15 W upto & including 100W, 230V Coiled Coil, B-22 Cap	IS 00418 : 78
16.	2383456	92-07-16	Shree Shyam Udyog Indl. Area, PO Baroon, Distt. Aurangabad (Bihar)	15 Kg square tins for packing vanaspati and Edible oils	IS 10325 : 89
17.	2383557	92-07-16	Krishna Hyderabad limes Pvt. Ltd. V.P.O. Sindrath Distt. Sirdhi (Raj.) 307001	Ordinary portland cement 33 grade	IS 00269 : 89
18.	2383658	92-07-16	Lakshmi Paint Industries, G.T. Road, Opp. Maya Cinema, Chhcharta, Amritsar.	Distemper, Oil Emulsion, Jhade Pale Cream only	IS 00428 : 69
19.	2383759	92-07-16	Dattatraya Cables Pvt. Ltd., A 2/3, MIDC Kalmeshwar Distt. Nagpur.	Aluminium conductors, galvanized steel Reinforced for overhead transmission purposes	IS 00398 : 76 Part: 02
20.	2383860	92-07-16	DRM Steel Industries Pvt. Ltd., Murbad Road, Ulhasnagar, Distt. Thane 421001	Structural steel (standard quality)	IS 00226 : 75
21.	2383961	92-07-16	Modern Products, Keshakaka Compound I.B. Patel Road, Goregaon (E) P.B. No. 9075 Bombay-400063	Ceiling roses, 5A, 250V, 63.5 mm size surface type	IS 00371 : 79
22.	2384054	92-07-16	Searle (India) Ltd., 2702/A, GIDC Estate, Ankleshwar-393002	Chlorpyrifos 220% (M/M) EC formulaton only	IS 08944 : 78
23.	2384155	92-07-16	Devi Pesticides S. No. 737/5, Servugampatti, Battagundu Nilakottai Taluq, Distt. Madurai (TN) 624202	Monocrotophos 36% (m/m) SL formula- tion only	IS 08074 : 90
24.	2384256	92-07-16	Kotumal Sons Oils Pvt. Ltd., 153' L.B.S. Marg, Bhandup Bombay-400078	Vanaspati	IS : 10633 : 86
25.	2384357	92-07-16	Mittal Brothers, Plot No. 202 (G) Ajmer Road, Sodala, Jaipur-302006	Integral cement water proofing compound (Powder Foam only)	IS 02645 : 75
26.	2384458	92-07-16	Agrawal Round Rolling Mills Ltd. G.E. Road. Tatibandh Raipur (MP)	Weldable structural steel grade : Fe 410 WA	IS 02062 : 84
27.	2384559	92-07-16	Bhilal Structurals 29-B, Indl. Estate, Bhilai (MP) 490026	HSD Steel Bars, Grade Fe 415 sizes 8 mm to 20 mm (excluding 18 mm)	IS 01786 : 85
28.	2384660	92-07-16	Hind Pumps Ltd., Tehsil Shikdhabad Distt. Firdzabad (UP)	Tubular fluorescent lamps for general light- ing service, 40W, 6500 Deg. K	IS 02418 : 77 Part : 01

1	2	3	4	5	6
29.	2384761	92-07-16	Water Value Works Basti Babakhel, Kapurthala Road Jalandhar	Copper alloy gate valves, class I, screwed ends, integral body seats, screwed in Bonnet, Non-Rising stem, solid wedge, sizes 15 mm to 50 mm	IS 00778 : 84
30.	2384862	92-07-16	Chemi Udyog (Regd.) K.H. 86, Pehlad Pur Bawana Road, Delhi-110042	Disinfectant fluid, black class A, type-normal, Grade 3 only.	IS 01061 : 82
31.	2384863	92-07-16	Narsingh Electrical industries, 27/13/2, Village & PO Badli, Delhi-11004	PVC insulated cables for working voltages upto & including 1100V, Sheathed & unsheathed with aluminium & copper conductors	IS 00694 : 77
32.	2385056	92-07-16	Pesto Chem India 320, Karawal Nagar, Delhi-110094	Malathion 25% (m/m) WDPC formulation only	IS 02569 : 78
33.	2385157	92-07-16	Delton Industries 103-A, Sivasakthi colony Ganapathy, Coimbatore-641006	Single-Phase small AC electric motors, 240 V, 0.37 KW and 0.75 KW Ratings with class B insulation, capacitor start and run type	IS 00996 : 79
34.	2385258	92-07-16	Sri Balaji Cable Industries Indl. Estate, Bellary Road, Anantpur (AP) 515004	Aluminium conductors, galvanized steel reinforced for overhead transmission purposes	IS 00398 : 76 Part : 02
35.	2385359	92-07-16	Vijaya Chemicals Survey No. 91 Manappakkam Village, Madras-600116	Malathion 50% (m/m) EC formulation only	IS 02567 : 78
36.	2385460	92-07-16	Sir Engg. Pvt. Ltd., C-1/B 225, GIDC Estate, Waghodia Distt. Vadodara 391760	Aluminium conductors, galvanized steel reinforced for overhead transmission purposes	IS 00398 : 76 Part : 02
37.	2385561	92-07-16	Jain Chemicals 767, Phase II Indl Area, Chandigarh	Disinfectant Fluid, Black Class A, Type normal and grade 3 only	IS 01061 : 82
38.	2385662	92-07-16	Gujarat Pesticides F-15, GIDC Estate Naroda Phase II Behind NEC Tiles Modern Road, Ahmedabad-382330	Monocrotophos 36% (m/m) SL formulation only	IS 08074 : 90
39.	2385763	92-07-16	Costnic Industries KMP Building 32, Mohammed rewthar street Hazirpet Coimbatore-641001	Single-Phase small AC electric motors, 0.37 KW, 240 V Class B, insulation, capacitor start and run type	IS 00996 : 79
40.	2385864	92-07-16	Tex ACE Traders 71, South Street No. 4 K.R. Puram Coimbatore 641006	Single-Phase small AC Electric motors 0.75 KW, 240V, Class B Insulation, capacitor start and run type	IS 00996 : 79
41.	2385965	92-07-16	H.K. Cement Pipe Co. Pvt. Ltd., Plot No. 58 Indl. Area Phase I, Panchkula Distt. Ambala (Haryana)	Manhole covers, medium and heavy duty grade	IS 12592 : 88 Part : 01
42.	2386058	92-07-01	S.N. Chemical Industries Tigaon Road, Old Faridabad (Haryana)	Copper oxychloride 50% (m/m) WDP concentrate formulation only	IS 01507 : 77

1	2	3	4	5	6
43.	2386159	92-07-16	Montari Industries Ltd., Village Toansa Teh Balachaur Distt. Hoshiarpur	Butachlor, Technical	IS No.09355 : 80
44.	2386260	92-07-16	Maruti Piston Pvt. Ltd. CIB-25/3, GIDC Estate, Kalol (Guj.) 382725	Aluminium alloy pistons for IC Engines, Diameter range 50 mm to 80 mm	IS 08503 : 86
45.	2386361	92-07-16	The Kanyakumari Distt. Co-op. spinning Mills Ltd. Aralvaymozhi Distt. Kanyakumari 629301	Cotton and cotton regenerated cellulosic Fibre blended grey yarn, PL Grade, carded	IS 00171 : 85
46.	2386462	92-08-01	Ashoka Concrete & Allied Indus. Trics (P) Ltd., Palasdiha, Kanyapur Asansol (WB)	Portland Slag Cement	IS 00455 : 89
47.	2386563	92-08-01	Mentor Cable Corpn. 10169/16, Katra Chajju Pindit model Basti Indl. Area New Delhi 110005	PVC Insulated (Heavy Duty) electric cables for working voltages upto & including 1100V. Armoured and unarmoured with Aluminium & Copper conductor	IS 01554 : 88 Part : 01
48.	2386664	92-08-01	Shivam Domestic Appliances WZ-3-A, Naraina Village Delhi-110028	Domestic stoves for use with LPG, with double CI burners Ni/Cr plated and stainless steel taper front body	IS 04246 : 84
49.	2386765	92-08-01	Capital Traders A-6, Street No. 4, Indl. Area Anand Parbat New Delhi-110005	Single-Phase small AC fan duty motors, 230V Class E insulation 11 W rating of shaded Pole type and 105 W, 123 W and 147 W of capacitors start & run type	IS 00996 : 79
50.	2386866	92-08-01	Hira Industries Ltd, Village Pandripani Geedam Road Jabalpur	Sulphate resisting portland cement	IS 12330 : 88
51.	2386967	92-08-01	Palwaat Conductors 32 KM Stone, G.T. Road, Pao Maniyari Kundli, Sonapat (Haryana) 131028	Aluminium conductors, galvanized steel reinforced for overhead transmission pur- poses	IS 00398 : 76 Part : 02
52.	2387060	92-08-01	Lalgec Meters & Electricals (India) Pvt. Ltd. Gatkar Mandi Gatkar Mandi (HP) 175021	AC Electricity Meters.	IS 00722 : 77 Part : 02
53.	2387161	92-08-01	Supreme methods Pvt. Ltd. G-854/14 N, VKI Area, Jaipur 302013	Galvanized steel wires for the core of Alu- minium conductors galvanized steel rein- forced for overhead transmission purposes	IS 00398 : 76 Part : 02
54.	2387262	92-08-01	Lodhi Calcium Products Pvt. Ltd, Ungaranigundla Village Dhone Mandal Distt. Kurnool (AP)	Ordinary portland cement 33 grade	IS 00269 : 89
55.	2387363	92-08-01	Kakatiya Cements Ltd., Srinivasanagar Jaggayyapeta Distt. Krishna (AP) 521175	Ordinary portland cement 43 grade	IS 68112 : 89
56.	2387464	92-07-16	Man Aluminium Ltd., Plot No. 67/A Indl. Area Pithampur Distt. Dhar (MP)	Aluminium tubes for irrigation purposes (extruded tubes)	IS 07092 : 76 Part : 02
57.	2387565	92-08-01	Bharat Conductors Pvt. Ltd. 116, 2nd Stage, 3rd Phase Peenya Indl. Area, Bangalore 560058	Aluminium conductors, Galvanized steel reinforced for extra high voltage over- power lines (400 KV and above)	IS 00398 - 82 Part : 05

1	2	3	4	5	6
58. 2387666	92-08-01	Venus electrical Appliances 16/250, Block 1 Road No. 3 Bhapa Nagar, Karol Bagh, New Delhi-110005	Electric irons, thermostatic, 750W, 230 V, with Cast iron sole plate	IS 00366 : 85	
59. 2387767	92-08-01	N.P. Electricals S-66-A, Gali No. 2 Vishnu Garden, New Delhi-110018	Single-Phase small AC Fan Duty Motors	IS 00996 : 79	
60. 2387868	92-08-01	Falcon products G-63, Sector VI, Noida (UP) 201301	Hydraulically regulated door closers	IS 03564 : 86	
61. 2387969	92-08-01	R.S. Industries (Rolling Mills P. Ltd., A-241-242 (b) Road No. 6-D, V.K. 1 Area, Jaipur-302013	Structural steel (high tensile)	IS 00961 : 75	
62. 2388062	92-08-01	Batra Iron & Steel Works (P) Ltd. G.E. Road Kumhari Distt. Durg (MP) 490042	Weldable structural steel grade Fe 410 WA	IS 02062 : 84	
63. 2388163	92-08-01	Malleable Steel Products 337, Shiv Shakti Nagar Near Shiv Temple Meerut City (UP) 250002	Malleable cast iron pipe fittings	IS 01879 : 87	
64. 2388264	92-08-01	Rajinder Steels Ltd., 23rd KM Mile Stone Village Chiraura Rania Kanpur Distt.	Lancing Pipes	IS 10577 : 82	
65. 2388365	92-08-01	Rajinder Steels Ltd. 23rd KM Mile Stone Village Chiraura Rania, Kanpur Distt.	Electrically welded steel pipes etc., grade Fe 330, Black plain ends, outside DIA 168.3 mm	IS 03589 : 81	
66. 2388466	92-08-01	Rajinder Steel Ltd. 23rd KM Mile Stone Village Chiraura Rania Kanpur Distt.	Steel tubes for mechanical and general Engg. purposes, ERW grade WT 160	IS 03601 : 84	
67. 2388567	92-08-01	Santha Industries 480-A, Avanashi Road, Peelamedu Coimbatore 641004	Single-Phase Small AC Electric Motors	IS 00996 : 79	
68. 2388668	92-08-01	Shri Dhanalakshmi Foundry 1352-A, Sathy Road, (Near C.M.S. School) Ganapathy Coimbatore 641006	Monoset pumps for agricultural purposes	IS 09079 : 89	
69. 2388769	92-08-01	Rajhans Ceramics Inds. Nawagam (Ramangbore) Taluka Chorila Distt. Surenderanagar	Salt Glazed stoneware pipes of grade A, size 100 and 150 mm	IS 00651 : 80	
70. 2388870	92-08-01	Shivam Pumps & Engg. Corpn. Gandevi Road, Devsar, Bilimora, Distt. Valsad (Guj.) 396380	Submersible pumpsets model SN53	IS 08034 : 89	
71. 2388971	92-08-01	Charmex Products Unit No. 26, II Floor Jay Kay Indl. Estate Linking Road, Extn. Santacruz (W) Bombay 400054	Ceiling Roses, 5A, 230 V AC only	IS 00371 : 79	

1	2	3	4	5	6
72. 2389064	92-08-01	Arun Pipes Ltd., F-78, 82 & 83 Sipcot Indl. Complex Gummidipoondi 601201	M.S. Tubes ErW, black, 50 mm NB, Light Class, YST 210	IS 01161 : 79	
73. 2389165	92-08-01	Ashok Cables Manipur Tal : Vyara S. H. No. 66 Distt. Surat (Gujarat)	Aluminium stranded conductors for over- head transmission purposes	IS 00398 : 76 Part : 01	
74. 2389266	92-08-01	Ashok Cables Manipur Tal : Vyara S. H. No. 66, Distt. Surat (Gujarat)	Aluminium conductors steel reinforced for overhead transmission purposes	IS 00398 : 76 Part : 02	
75. 2389367	92-08-01	LMM International Howrah-Amte Road Bankra, Howrah-711105	1.6 t Lifting capacity hand operated uni- versal gearless pulling and lifting machine	IS 05604 : 84	
76. 2389468	92-08-01	Precision Engineering Works 51, A To Z, Indl. Estate, Ferguson Road, Lower Parel, Bombay 400013	Three-Phase Squirrel Cage induction motor for centrifugal pumps for agricultural Applications	IS 07538 : 75	
77. 2389569	92-08-01	Eastern Bird B/28, New Indl. Estate Jagatpur Cuttack 754021	Non ferrous metal (Aluminium Alloy) tower bolts-type 4 (Barrel type)	IS 00204 : 78 Part : 02	
78. 2389670	92-08-01	Eastern Bird, B/28, New Indl. Estate, Jagatpur Cuttack 754021	Non-Ferrous Metal (Aluminium Alloys) Sliding door bolts (Aldrops)	IS 02681 : 79	
79. 2389771	92-08-01	Deepak Industries B-150, Sector VI Noida (UP) 201301	Steel back flap hinges, sizes 75 mm, Heavy weight	IS 03843 : 85	
80. 2389872	92-08-01	Archana Steels Ltd. 3, Indl. Area, Chandigarh 160002	HSD Steel bars, grade Fe 415 size 8 to 25 mm	IS 01786 : 85	
81. 2389973	92-08-01	Lakshmi Steel Rolling Mills P.B. No. 85 G.T. Road Opp. Power House Khanna.	Weldable structural steel, grade Fe 410 WA, IS 02062 : 84 round bars size upto & including 40 mm dia		
82. 2390049	92-08-01	Rajinder Steels Ltd. 23rd KM Mile Stone Village Chiraura, Rania, Kanpur Dehat	Steel tubes for idlers for belt conveyers ERW grade Yst 210	IS 09295 : 83	
83. 2390150	92-08-01	INDO Tech Engineers 13-A, Mohkampur Indl. Complex Delhi-Meerut Road Meerut	Welded Low Carbon Steel Gas cylinders for low pressure liquifiable gases of 2.4 and 4 Litres water capacity	IS 07142 : 74	
84. 2390251	92-08-01	Standard Industries 1/6, Pera Naidu Street PN Palayam Coimbatore 641037	Single-Phase Small AC Electric Motors, 240V, Capacitor start and Run Type	IS 00996 : 79	
85. 2390352	92-08-01	Gujarat Cycles Ltd. 187, GIDC Estate Waghodia Distt. Baroda 391760	Transmission roller steel chains, Designation 081-1	IS 02403 : 75	
86. 2390453	92-08-01	Bali Chemicals 3107, Indl. Area-2 Ram Darbar, Chandigarh 160002	Disinfectant Fluid, Black type-Normal, Class A grade 3 only	IS 01061 : 82	

1	2	3	4	5	6
87.	2390554	92-08-01	Bharat Pesticides Mfg. Co. E-17, DSIDC Indl. Complex Rohtak Road Nangloi Delhi-110041	2, 4-D, Ethyl ester 34 % (m/m) EC formula- tion only	IS 10243 : 82
88.	2390655	92-08-01	Hilton Precisions Ltd. 19-C, Sector 2, Parwanoo	Steel butt hinges, medium weight, 75 to 125 MM size	IS 01341 : 81
89.	2390756	92-08-01	North Eastern Cables & Conduc- tors (P) Ltd., F-44, Indl. Area, Sikar (Raj.) 332001	Aluminium stranded conductors for over- head transmission purposes	IS 00398 : 76 Part : 01
90.	2390857	92-08-01	Sameer Safety Equipments B-30, Minerva Indl. Estate P.K. Road Behind Sai-Dham Building Mulund Bombay-400080	Portable fire extinguishers carbon dioxide type 2 Kg capacity only	IS 02878 : 86
91.	2390958	92-08-01	Rai Metal Works Rai village, Via Bhyander Distt. Thane (MS)	HSD steel bars of grade Fe 415 sizes 8 to 25 mm	IS 01786:85
92.	2391051	92-08-01	Jai Steel Industries 363, Harrisganj Kanpur 208004	HSD steel bars grade Fe 500 only sizes 8 to 32 mm	IS 01786 : 85
93.	2391152	92-08-01	Ennore Chemicals & Fertilizers (P) Ltd., Post Bag No. 13 Jennore express high Road Ennore, Madras 600057	Zinc sulphate, agricultural grade	IS 08249 : 76
94.	2391253	92-08-01	Gupta Chemicals Pvt. Ltd., B-144, Road No. 9 VKI Area Jaipur 302013	Phosphamidon 85% (m/m) WS concentrate formulation only	IS 06177 : 81
95.	2391354	92-08-01	Jyoti Cements Pvt. Ltd. F-68 B, 70, Indl. Area, Behror Distt. Alwar 310701	Ordinary portland cement 33 grade	IS 00269 : 89
96.	2391455	92-08-01	Goel Containers Pvt. Ltd. 809, Sector III Pithampur Distt. Dhar (MP)	UPVC pipes for potable water supplies	IS 04985 : 88
97.	2391556	92-08-01	King Steel Rolling Mills G.T. Road (Sirhind Side) Mandi Gobindgarh	HSD Steel Bars, Grade Fe 415 Sizes 8 to 25 mm	IS 01786 : 85
98.	2391657	92-08-01	Raathi Pipes & Profiles Pvt. Ltd., G 1 to G 4 & G 11 to G 12 Indl. Estate, Suryapet Distt. Nalgonda (AP) 508214	UPVC pipes for potable water supplies	IS 04985 : 88
99.	2391758	92-08-01	M.K. Vinyl (P) Ltd., G.T. Road Indl. Area, Chaudagra, Post Mauhar, Distt. Fatehpur (UP)	UPVC pipes for potable water supplies	IS 04985 : 88
100.	2391859	92-08-01	Annapurna Steel (P) Ltd., Narain Nagar Bajpur Road, Kashipur (Nainital) (UP)	Cast billet ingots for rolling into structural steel (Standard Quality)	IS 06914 : 78

1	2	3	4	5	6
101. 2391960	92-08-01	Tech Steel Products Pvt. Ltd. 671, Nagavara Main Road Arabic College Post Bangalore 560045	Drums, Large Fixed end grade B, Type I	IS 01783 : 88 Part : 02	
102. 2392053	92-08-01	Devidayal & Mahindra Cables (P) Ltd. Khasra No. 61, Village & PO Matiala, Najafgarh Road, New Delhi 110059	PVC insulated (Heavy Duty) Electric cables for working voltages upto & including 1100V unarmoured with copper conductor	IS 01554 : 88 Part : 01	
103. 2392154	92-08-01	Torrent Cables Ltd. (Formerly Mahendra Electrical Ltd.) Village Kamala, Mission Road, Nadiad Distt. Kheda (Gujarat) 387001	Cross linked polyethylene insulated and PVC Sheathed cables for working vol- tages upto & including 1100V, Armour- ed & unarmoured with Aluminium conductors	IS 07098 : 88 Part : 01	
104. 2392255	92-08-01	Arihant Conductors Bhalej Road near Over Bridge Anand (Gujarat) 388001	Aluminium conductors, galvanized steel reinforced for overhead transmission purposes	IS 00398:76 Part : 02	
105. 2392356	92-08-01	Arihant conductors Bhalej Road Near Over Bridge Anand (Gujarat) 388001	Aluminium stranded conductors for over- head transmission purposes	IS 00398 : 76 Part : 01	
106. 2392457	92-08-01	Oswal Electrical Conductors Gulab Niwas, M.I. Road, Jaipur 302001	Aluminium alloy stranded conductors (Aluminium-Magnesium Silicon type) for overhead Transmission purposes	IS 00398 : 79 Part : 04	
107. 2392558	92-08-01	Prakash Pipe Factory Dara Nagar Ganj Block-Baldor	Precast concrete pipes, class NP2 and NP3, size 350 mm only (Plain Ended)	IS 00458 : 88	

[No. CMD/13 : 11]

N. SRINIVASAN, Addl. Director General

नई दिल्ली, 30 दिसम्बर, 1992

का.ग्रा. 269.—भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो (प्रमाणन) विनियम, 1988 के विनियम 5 के उपविनियम (6) के अनुसरण में एतद्वारा अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि जिन प्रमाणन मुहर लाइसेंसों के विवरण नीचे दिए गए हैं, उनकी अवधि समाप्त हो गई है:

अनुसूची

क्र.सं.	लाइसेंस संख्या	लाइसेंसधारी का नाम और पता	सम्बद्ध भारतीय मानक की संख्या	रद्द किए जाने की तिथि
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1.	0186242	ईस्ट एंड सप्लायर्स कं., 12/1 कैनाल ईस्ट रोड, कलकत्ता-700004	IS 10 (भाग 2) : 1976	89-05-31
2.	0342836	वेलूमनी इंजीनियरिंग इंडस्ट्रीज, दुडियालूर पोस्ट, कोयम्बतूर-641034	IS 10001 : 1981	92-05-31
3.	0510124	रविन्द्र स्टील लि., 33/बी, एम आर्म्स डी सी इंड. एरिया, हिंगना रोड, नागपुर-440016	IS 6915 : 1978	92-04-15

1	2	3	4	5
4. 0581147	गुप्ता कैमीकल्स प्रा. लि., भानुमारिया बिल्डिंग, पहला तल, श्री जी की मोदी के सामने, त्रिपोलिया बाजार, जयपुर-302001	IS 1307 : 1988	92-06-30	
5. 0611736	रोलिस इंडिया लि., 20 हावड़ा रोड, सालकिया, हावड़ा-711186	IS 6429 : 1981	92-04-30	
6. 0700634	सिद्धार्थ प्लाईवुड इंडस्ट्रीज, 105/1 उल्टाङंगा मेन रोड, कलकत्ता-700004	IS 10 (भाग 2) : 1976	90-05-15	
7. 0760349	इश्वोर स्ट्रीट एन्टरप्राइजेज लि., 14, शम्भूदास स्ट्रीट, मद्रास-600001	IS 6914 : 1978	92-03-15	
8. 0830445	सेधीक प्लाईवुड इंड प्रा. लि., 1, स्कूल रोड हल्लू, कलकत्ता-700078	IS 10 (भाग 2) : 1976	89-01-15	
9. 0980060	राठी उद्योग लि., राठी मार्किट, नई सड़क, दिल्ली-110006	IS 226 : 1975	92-07-15	
10. 1044732	दि सेन्ट्रल ट्रेडिंग कं. प्रा. लि., 29 दमदम रोड, कलकत्ता-700074	IS 10 (भाग 2) : 1976	89-08-15	
11. 1097955	प. आर. दिवानजी एंड कं., 12-वी नेताजी सुभाष रोड, कलकत्ता-700001	IS 10 (भाग 2) : 1976	87-07-15	
12. 1192242	द्वारका दास बेलजी तालपत्री बाला, पो. बा. नं. 3099 योगेश्वर, 135/139, काजी सैयद स्ट्रीट, बम्बई-400003	IS 7903 : 1984	92-06-15	
13. 1275549	बिरला जूट एंड इंड. लि., यूनिट बिरला जूट मिल्स, 9/1, आर. एन. मुखर्जी रोड, कलकत्ता-700001	IS 2818 (भाग 2) : 1971	92-05-15	
14. 1383249	तिरुपति प्लाईवुड इंडस्ट्रीज, भकुमपथार, मारघेरिया (असम)	IS 10 (भाग 2) : 1976	87-02-28	
15. 1384251	हिमपेक्स प्रा. लि., 27 इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट, मेहतपुर, उना-174315	IS 7406 (भाग 1) : 1984	92-02-29	
16. 1337358	श्री पदमावती उद्योग, 19 सी, हरीश नियोगी रोड, कलकत्ता-700067	IS 10 (भाग 2) : 1976	89-03-15	
17. 1390549	रूबी इंडस्ट्रियल कारपोरेशन, ए-10, सेक्टर 5, नोएडा, गाजियाबाद	IS 4246 : 1984	92-03-15	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
18. 1420633	प्रमान्त इलेक्ट्रोडस, शिवाजी नगर, इंदौर-452003	IS 814 (भाग 2) : 19	92-04-30	
19. 1478866	आर. डी. वर्मा एंड कं. प्रा. लि., समयपुर, बवाना रोड, दिल्ली-110042	IS 1786 : 1985	91-11-30	
20. 1520339	क्रिस्टलर डीजल इंजीनियर प्रा. लि., पो. बा. नं. 268, 341 बालटेक्स रोड, मद्रास-600079	IS 10001 : 1981	92-02-29	
21. 1546150	ईलीसीमेंट एन्टरप्राइजेज, 1 इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, जोतवाड़ा, जयपुर-302012	IS 10325 : 1989	92-03-31	
22. 1553349	गुप्ता कैमीकल्स प्रा. लि., भुखमारिया बिल्डिंग, पहला तल, श्री जी की मोरी के सामने, त्रिपोलिया बाजार, जयपुर-302001	IS 9356 : 1980	93-06-30	
23. 1554351	संजीव इंडस्ट्रियल कारपोरेशन, शेड नं. 9, प्लॉट सं. 125 (ए), बी 9 आई एरिया, जयपुर 302013	IS 10325 : 1989	92-04-30	
24. 1559361	वेस्ट इंडिया स्टील कं. लि., तिस्को मानोर फरोक, कालीकट (केरल)	IS 1977 : 1975	92-05-15	
25. 1568867	कमारहटी कं. लि., 16 ए, शेवर्न रोड, कलकत्ता-700001	IS 2818 (भाग 3) : 1971	92-05-31	
26. 1678066	जयसवाल केमीकल्स प्रा. लि., एफ 8-1 एम आई डी सी इंड एरिया, हिगना रोड, नागपुर 440016	IS 1729 : 1979	92-04-15	
27. 1693264	इथियन एल पी जी सिलिन्डर्स प्रा. लि., ग्राम सोलाकनी, 20.8 किमी का पथर, बालक्रेट रोड, देहरादून	IS 3196 : 1982	92-05-31	
28. 1748970	प्रतिमा प्लाईवुड इंडस्ट्रीज, 2 गुरुदास दत्त गार्डन लेन, कलकत्ता-700067	IS 10 (भाग 2) : 1976	90-10-31	
29. 1756363	मार्डन केमीकल इंडस्ट्रीज, 84/6-ए, फजलगंज, कानपुर-208012	IS 1746 : 1985	91-11-30	
30. 1804954	एन. एस. ब्रदर्स, 6344 गली ईश्वरी प्रसाद, बाड़ा हिन्दुराव, दिल्ली-110006	IS 8808 : 1986	92-03-15	
31. 1819664	गोयनका इंडस्ट्रीज, एफ-374, शेड नं. 9 एफ, विश्वकर्मा इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, जयपुर	IS 9356 : 1980	92-04-30	
32. 1819866	न्यूलाइट प्लास्टिक्स, प्लॉट नं. 282 नांगलोई सकरावती, डा. नजफगढ़ रोड, दिल्ली-110043	IS 3389 : 1965	92-04-30	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
33. 1819967	न्यूलाइट प्लास्टिक्स प्लॉट नं. 282 नांगलोई, सकरावती, डा. नजफगढ़, नई दिल्ली-110043	IS 1300 : 1966	92-04-30	
34. 1820083	न्यूलाइट प्लास्टिक्स, प्लॉट नं. 282 नांगलोई, सकरावती, डा. नजफगढ़, नई दिल्ली-110043	IS 3669 : 1966	92-04-30	
35. 1821247	केजरीवाल आयरन एंड स्टील वर्क्स, धारुपाडी मेन्सन, 11 ब्रेवर्न रोड, पो.बा. नं. 990, कलकत्ता-700001	IS 7181 : 1986	92-05-15	
36. 1944364	रक्षित केमीकल्स, 4 सिगनलूर स्ट्रीट 9वां तल, कमरा नं. 921, कलकत्ता-700001	IS 299 : 1989	92-02-29	
37. 1969582	मेथना जूट मिल, यूनिट गजानंद कामर्शियल प्रा. लि., बनर्जी भवन, 15 ब्रेवर्न रोड (पांचवा तल), कलकत्ता-700001	IS 1943 : 1964	92-04-30	
38. 1969683	मेथना जूट मिल, यूनिट गजानंद कामर्शियल बनर्जी भवन, 15 ब्रेवर्न रोड, (पांचवा तल), कलकत्ता-700 001	IS 2818 (भाग 2) : 1971	92-04-30	
39. 1979080	हुगली लेमिनेटिंग इंड., 6 क्लाइव रोड, कलकत्ता-700001	IS 7406 (भाग 1) : 1984	92-05-15	
40. 1979787	एस. यू. सयमसेबिल पम्प प्रा. लि. जी-25 सेक्टर 11, नोएडा, जिला गाजियाबाद-201301	IS 8034 : 1989	92-05-15	
41. 2089557	जैनसंस मिनरल्स, यू. जी 5, शिवालिक हाउस 11, कस्मपुरा काम्पलेक्स, नई दिल्ली	IS 1307 : 1988	92-03-15	
42. 2090441	खेतावल बायर रोप्स प्रा. लि. 403 उर्ला इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, रायपुर-493221	IS 2581 : 1977	92-05-15	
43. 2094247	कुल्गा केमीकल इंडस्ट्रीज, सुजागंज, भागलपुर-812 002	IS 2568 : 1978	92-03-31	
44. 2111120	पाँवनीयर एक्सपोर्ट्स प्रा लि., बी-1, 650 कुन्दनपुर, लुधियाना	IS 11170 : 1985	92-04-30	
45. 2119742	गर्ग फास्टनर्स, 34, 34, जी एन टी रोड, माधवरम, मद्रास-600110	IS 1939 : 1982	92-05-31	
46. 2122428	कमारहट्टी कं. लि. 16 ए, ब्रेवर्न रोड, कलकत्ता-700 001	IS 10036 (भाग 2) : 1982	92-05-31	

Bureau of Indian Standards
New Delhi, the 30th December, 1992

S. O. 269.—In pursuance of sub-regulation (6) of Regulation 5 of the Bureau of Indian Standards (Certification) Regulations, 1988, it is hereby notified that the Certification Marks Licences, details of which are mentioned in the following Schedule, have expired :

SCHEDULE

Sl. Licence No.	Name of the Licensee	No. of the relevant Indian Standard	Date of expiry
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1 0186242	Eastend Supply Co. 12/1, Canal East Road, Calcutta-700004.	IS 10(Part 2): 1976	89/05/31
2 0342836	Velumani Engineering Industry, Tudiyalur post, Coimbatore-641034.	IS 10001 : 1981	92/05/31
3 0510124	Ravindra Steel Ltd. 33/B, MIDC Indl. Area, Hingna Road, Nagpur-440016.	IS 6915 : 1978	92/04/15
4 0581147	Gupta Chemicals Pvt. Ltd. Bhukmaria Building, Ist Floor, Opp. Shri Ji Ki Mori Tripolia Bazar, Jaipur-302001.	IS 1307 : 1988	92/06/30
5 0611736	Rallis India Ltd. 20, Howrah Road, Salkia, Howrah-711106.	IS 6429 : 1981	92/04/30
6 0700634	Siddhartha Plywood Industries, 105/1, Ultadanga Main Road, Calcutta-700004.	IS 10(Part 2):1976	90/05/15
7 0760349	Ennore Steel Enterprise Ltd. 14, Senbudoss Street, Madras-600001.	IS 4914 : 1978	92/03/15
8 0830445	Sevoke Plywood Inds. Pvt. Ltd. I, School Road, Haltu, Calcutta-700078.	IS 10(Part 2):1976	89/01/15
9 0980060	Rathi Udyog Ltd., Rathi Market, Nai Sarak. Delhi-110006.	IS 226:1975	92/07/15
10 1044732	The Central Trading Co. Pvt. Ltd. 29, Dum Dum Road, Calcutta-700074.	IS 10(Part 2):1976	89/03/15
11 1097955	A.R. Diwanjee & Co., 12B, Netaji Subhash Road, Calcutta-700001.	IS 10(Part 2): 1976	89/07/15
12 1192242	Dwarkadas Velji Talpatriwala Post Box No. 3099, Yogeshwar, 135/139, Kazi Syed Street, Bombay-400003.	IS 7903 : 1984	92/06/15
13 1275549	Birla Jute & Ind. Ltd. Unit : Birla Jute Mills, 9/1, R.N. Mukherjee Road, Calcutta-700001.	IS 2318(Part 2): 1971	92/05/15
14 1383249	Tirupati Plywood Industries, Makumpathar Nargherita (Assam)	IS 10(Part 2):1976	87/02/28

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
15	1384251 Himtex Pvt. Ltd. 27, Industrial Estate Mehatpur Una 174315	IS 7406(Part 1): 1984	92/02/29
16	1387358 Shri Padmavati Udyog 19C, Harish Neogi Road, Calcutta 67	IS 10(Part 2): 1976	89/03/15
17	1390549 Ruby Industrial Corporation, A-10, Sector V, NOIDA Ghaziabad.	IS 4246 : 1984	92/03/15
18	1420633 Prashant Electrodes , Shivaji Nagar, Indore 452003	IS 814 (Part 2):19	92/04/30
19	1478866 R.D. Verma & Co. Pvt. Ltd. Samayur Bawana Road, Delhi 110042	IS 1786:1985	91/11/30
20	1520334 Krislar Diesel Engineer Pvt. Ltd. P.O. Box 268, 341 Waltax Road, Madras 600079	IS 10001-1981	92/02/29
21	1546150 Eleccimet Enterprises 1, Industrial Area, Jhotwara, Jaipur 302012.	IS 10325 : 1989	92/03/31
22	1553349 Gupta Chemicals Pvt. Ltd. Bhukmaria Building 1st Floor Opp. Shri Ji ki Mori Tripolia Bazar, Jaipur 302001.	IS 9356 : 1980	92/06/30
23	1554351 Sanjiv Industrial Corporation, Road No. 9, Plot No. 125(A) Vkiarea, Jaipur 302013	IS 10325:1989	92/04/30
24	1559361 West India Steel Co. Ltd. Wisco Manor Feroke, Calicut (Kerala)	IS 1977 : 1975	92/05/15
25	1568867 Kamarhatty Co. Ltd. 16A, Brabourne Road, Calcutta-700001.	IS 2818 (Part 2): 1971	92/05/31
26	1678066 Jayaswal Chemicals Pvt. Ltd. F/8-1, MIDC Indl. Area, Higna Road, Nagpur 440016	IS 1729 : 1979	92/04/15
27	1693264 Indian LPG Cylinders Ltd. Village Selakni 20.8. KM. Stone Chalcrate Road. Dehradun.	IS 3196 : 1982	92/05/31
28	1788970 Pratima Plywood Industries 2, Gurudas Dutta Garden Lane, Calcutta 700067	IS 10 (Part 2) : 1986	90/10/31
29	1756363 Modern Chemical Industries 85/6-A, Fazalganj Kanpur 208012	IS 1746 : 1985	91/11/30
30	1804954 N.S. Brothers 6344, Gali Ishwari Prasad Bara Hindu Rao, Delhi 110006	IS 8808 : 1985	92/03/15

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
31 1819664	Goenka Industries F-374, Road No. 9 F Vishwakarma Indl. Area Jaipur	IS 9356 : 1980	92/04/30
32 1819866	Nulite Plastics Plot No. 202 Nangloi Sakrawati P. O. Najafgarh, New Delhi 1100043	IS 3389 : 1965	92/04/30
33 1819967	Nulite Plastics Plot No. 202 Nangloi Sakrawati P. O. Najafgarh New Delhi 1100043.	IS 1300 : 1966	92/04/30
34 1820043	Nulite Plastics Plot No. 202 Nangloi Sakrawati P. O. Najafgarh New Delhi 110043	IS 3669 : 1976	92/04/30
35 1821247	Kejriwal Iron & Steel Works Draupadi Mansion 11, Braboun Road. P.O. Box No. 990 Calcutta 700001	IS 7181 : 1986	92/05/15
36 1944364	Rakshit Chemicals 3 Synagogue Street 9th Floor Room No. 921 Calcutta 700001	IS 299 : 1989	92/02/29
37 1969582	Meghna Jute Mills Unit of Gajanand Comml. Pvt. Ltd. Banerji Bhawan 15 Brabourne Road (5th Floor) Calcutta 700001	IS 1943 : 1964	92/04/30
38 1968683	Meghna Jute Mills unit of Gajanand Comml. Pvt. Ltd. Banerji Bhawan 15 Brabourne Road (5th Floor) Calcutta 700001	IS 2818 (Part 2): 1971	92/04/30
39 1979080	Hooghly Laminating Inds. 5, Clive Row Calcutta 700001	IS 7406 (Part 1) : 1984	92/05/15
40 1979787	S.U. Submersible Pumps Pvt. Ltd. G-25 Sector Noida Distt. Ghaziabad 201301	IS 8034 : 1989	92/05/15
41 2089557	Jainsons Minerals U.G.-5 Shivalik House II Karampura Complex. New Delhi.	IS 1307 : 1988	92/03/15
42 2090441	Khetawat Wiro Ropes Pvt. Ltd. 403 Urla Industrial Area Raipur 493221	IS 2581 : 1977	92/05/15
43 2094247	Krishna Chemical Industries Sujaganj Bhagalpur 812002	IS 2568 : 1978	92/03/31
44 2111120	Pioneer Exports Pvt. Ltd. B-1, 650 Kundan Puri Ludhiana	IS 11170 : 1985	92/04/30
45 2119742	Garg Fasteners 34, G.N.T. Road Madhavaram Madras 600110	IS 1929 : 1982	92/05/31
46 2122428	Kamarhatti Co Ltd. 16 A Braborune Road Calcutta 700001	IS:10036(Part 2):1982	92/05/31

नई दिल्ली, 31 दिसम्बर, 1993

का.आ. 270.—भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो (प्रमाणन) विनियम 1988 के विनियम 5 उपविनियम (6) के अनुसरण में एतद्वारा अधिपूचित किया जाता है कि जिन प्रमाणन दर लाइसेंसों के विवरण नीचे दिए गए हैं, उनकी अवधि समाप्त हो गई है:

अनुसूची

क्र.सं.	लाइसेंस संख्या	लाइसेंसधारी का नाम और पता	सम्बद्ध भारतीय मानक की सं.	रद्द किए जाने की तिथि
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1.	199758 7	फोर्ट विलियम कं. लि., 10, क्लाइव रो, तीसरा तल, कलकत्ता-700001	IS 7407 (भाग 2) : 198 0	92-07-15
2.	2123026	दि इंडिया जूट कं. लि., 16 स्ट्रैट रोड, कलकत्ता-700 001	IS 7407 (भाग 2) : 198 0	92-05-31
3.	1978 98 7	वेस्ट बंगाल सेमिनेटर्स प्रा. लि., 16ए ऐबरेस्ट हाउस, 46/मी, चोरंगी रोड, कलकत्ता-700071	IS 7406 (भाग 1) : 193 4	92-05-15
4	1694064	मालिआकाल टिम्बर इंडस्ट्रीज, ए.एम. रोड, इरिगोने, डा. पट्टेदम, पेरम्बेबूर	IS 10 (भाग 3) : 1976	92-06-15
5.	1572959	प्रीति स्पन पाइप, रोशनपुरा नजफगढ़, नई दिल्ली	IS 458 : 198 8	92-06-15
6.	1504639	राप्ती सिरेमिक्स इंडस्ट्रीज लि., इसनापुर-502329, जिला मेडक	IS 2556 (भाग 2) : 1974	92-07-31
7.	1499369	स्पिन मैच इंड., 6 नामा सुन्दर पाड़ा लेन, कलकत्ता-700090	IS 10 (भाग 2) : 1976	92-01-15
8.	2113629	प्रकाश इंडस्ट्रीज, इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया-1, चंडीगढ़।	IS 3564 : 1975	92-05-15
9.	2244644	भारतीय कंक्रीट पाइप उद्योग, प्लॉट नं. 7 से 20, इंड. एरिया, बलरोमपुर जिला गौड़ा (उ.प्र.)	IS 458 : 1988	92-05-31
10.	0896576	शारदा प्लास्टर इंडस्ट्रीज लि. जयपुर रोड, डा. जयपुर, अजमेर	IS 4990 : 1931	89-09-30
11.	1236438	जे.एन. सांकेटेड सीमेंट पाइप वर्क्स, 14 एफ, लोअर सर्कुलर रोड, कलकत्ता-700017	IS 458 : 1988	91-09-30
12.	00078 22	क्रास प्लाई एंड टावर प्रा. लि. 7ए लोअर सर्कुलर रोड कलकत्ता-700517	IS 10 (भाग 2) : 1976	92-01-31

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
13. 0286751	ए. आर. दीवानजी एंड कं., 12, बी नेताजी सुभाष रोड, कलकत्ता-700001	IS 10 (भाग 4') : 1976	92-02-15	
14. 0335738	टाटा आयरन एंड स्टील कं. लि., 20-जे एम. जी. रोड, बंगलौर-560001	IS 1786 : 1985	92-03-15	
15. 0949066	गौरी शंकर एंड कं., माकुम रोड, उदयपुर, तिनसुकिया-786125	IS 10 (भाग 3) : 1976	92-03-15	
16. 2009129	पेस्टीसाइड्स इंडिया, पो. बा. नं. 20, उदयसागर, रोड, उदयपुर-313001	IS 11997 : 1987	92-07-31	
17. 1823655	बी. वी. जे. ग्लास इंड, 185 गिरीश घोष रोड, बेलूर, हावड़ा	IS 1392 : 1983	92-05-15	
18. 2002620	किसान एग्री केमीकल्स, पो. बा. नं. 28, कोर्ट रोड, मूजफरनगर-251001	IS 3903 : 1984	92-07-15	
19. 1785067	ग्लिनडिया लिमिटेड, मुंजुर गढ़ी, अलीगढ़-251001	IS 1547 : 1985	92-07-15	
20. 1577666	मोतीलाल पेस्टीसाइड्स (इंडिया) प्रा. लि., मसानी-दिल्ली रोड, मथुरा 281001	IS 10950 : 1984	92-06-30	
21. 0604032	अगिल मैन्यूफैक्चर्स, 2 मबाडी प्लॉट, राजकोट-300004	IS 10001 : 1981	92-06-15	
22. 1704546	गोयनका इंडस्ट्रीज, एफ-374, रोड नं. 9 एफ विश्वकर्मा इंड एरिया, जयपुर	IS 562 : 1978	92-06-15	
23. 1059745	भगवती प्लाईवूड इंडस्ट्रीज, मातीमार पायकावाड़ी रोड, सिलीगुड़ी, दार्जिलिंग	IS 10 (भाग 2) : 1976	92-03-31	
24. 1309944	लक्ष्मी स्पन पाइप इंडस्ट्रीज, 83 मोहिले नगर, अल्लाहपुर, जिला इलाहाबाद	IS 458 : 1988	92-05-15	
25. 1375048	बी एस ग्रार्ह इंजी. वर्क्स, जी टी रोड, फगवाड़ा-144401	IS 5455 : 1969	92-02-29	
26. 2233942	मिडपोस्ट (इक्विन) क्विपमेंट्स प्रा. लि., जे. बी. इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट, ग्राम कसुडी (के. वी.) तालूक मोर, जिला पुणे।	IS 9079 : 1989	92-03-31	

[सं. के प्र वि 13 : 14]

एम. श्रीनिवासन, अपर सहायनियोग

New Delhi, the 31st December, 1992

S. O. 70—In pursuance of sub-regulation (6) of Regulation 5 of the Bureau of Indian Standards (Certification) Regulations, 1988, it is hereby notified that the Certification Marks Licences, details of which are mentioned in the following Schedule, have expired :

THE SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Licence No.	Name of the licensee	No. of the relevant Indian Standard	Date of expiry
(1)		(2)	(3)	(4)
1	997587	Fort William Co. Ltd. 10, Clive Row, Third Floor Calcutta 700001	IS 7407 (Part 2):1980	92/07/15
2	2123026	The India Jute Co. Ltd. 16, Etrand Road Calcutta-700001.	IS 7407(Part 2) : 1980	92/05/31
3	1978987	West Bengal Laminators Pvt. Ltd. 16-A, Everest House 46/C, Chowringhee Road Calcutta-700071.	IS 7406 (Part 1) : 1984	92/05/15
4	1694064	Maliakal Timber Industries A.M. Road Iringole P.O. Pattai Perumbaveor.	IS 10 (Part 3) : 1976	92/06/15
5	1572959	Preeti Spun Pipe Roshan Pura Najafgarh, New Delhi.	IS 458 : 1988	92/06/15
6	1503639	Raasi Ceramic Industries Ltd. Isnapur 502329 Distt. Medak.	IS:2556 (Part 2): 1974	92/07/31
7	1499369	Spin Mech Inds. 6, Nama Sudra Para Lane Calcutta 700090	IS 10(Part 2): 1976	92/01/15
8	2113629	Prakash Industries 136/140-93 Industrial Area-I Chandigarh	IS 3564 : 1975	92/05/15
9	2244644	Bhartiya Concrete Pipe Udyog Plot No. 7 to 20 Indl. Area Balrampur Distt. Gonda (U.P.)	IS 458 : 1988	92/05/13
10	0896576	Sarda Plywood Industries Ltd. Jaypore Road P. O. Jaypore Assam.	IS 4990 : 1981	89/09/30
11	1236438	J.N. Socketed Cement Pipe Works 14F Rampur Garden Bareilly	IS 458:1988	91/09/30

1	2	3	4	5
12.	0007822	Crossley and Towers Pvt. Ltd. 7A, Lower Circular Road Calcutta 700017	IS 10(Part 2): 1976	92/01/31
13.	0286751	A.R. Diwanjee & Co. 12B, Netaji Subash Road. Calcutta 700001	IS 10(Part 4):1976	92/02/15
14.	0335738	Tata Iron & Steel Co. Ltd. 20-J, M.G. Road Bangalore 560001	IS 1786 : 1985	92/03/15
15.	0949066	Gauri Shanker & Co. Makum Road Tinsukia 786125	IS 10(Part3): 1976	92/03/15
16.	2009129	Pesticides India P.B. No. 20 Udaisagar Road, Udaipur 313001	IS 11997 : 1987	92/07/31
17.	1823655	BDJ Glass Inds. 185, Girish Ghosh Road, Belur Howrah	IS 1392:1983	92/05/15
18.	2002620	Kissan Agro Chemicals P.B. No. 248, Court Road, Muzaaffarnagar, 251001	IS 3903:1984	92/07/15
19.	1785067	GL India Limited. Manzurgarhi, Aligarh 202001	IS 1547:1985	92/07/15
20.	1577666	Motilal Pesticides (India) Pvt. Ltd. Masani-Delhi Road Mathura 281003	IS:10950:1984	92/06/30
21.	0604032	Anil Manufacturers 2. Mavdi Plot Rajkot 360004	IS 10001:1981	92/06/15
22.	1704546	Goenka Industries F-374, Road No. 9 F Vishwakarma, Indl. Area Jaipur.	IS 562:1978	92/06/15
23.	1059745	Bhagwati Plywood Industries Matigara, Pamkabari Road Siliguri Darjeeling	IS 10(Part 2): 1976	92/03/31
24.	1309944	Lakshmi Spun Pipe Industry 85, Mohiley Nagar Allahpur Distt. Allahabad.	IS 458:1988	92/05/15
25.	1375048	B.S.Y. Engg. Works G.T. Road, Phagwara 144401	IS 5455:1969	92/02/29
26.	2233942	Midwest (Dakkan) Equipment Pvt. Ltd. JP Indl. Estate Village Kasurdi (KB) Tal. Bhor Distt. Pune	IS 9079:1989	92/03/31

[No. CMD/13:14]

N. SRINIVASAN, Director General

नई दिल्ली, 4 जनवरी, 1993

का.प्रा.271—भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो (प्रमाणन) विनियम, 1988 के विनियम 5 के उपविनियम (6) के अनुसरण में एतद्द्वारा अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि जिन प्रमाणन मुहर लाइसेंसों के विवरण नीचे दिए गए हैं, उनकी अवधि समाप्त हो गई है :

अनुसूची

क्र.सं.	लाइसेंस संख्या	लाइसेंसधारी का नाम और पता	सम्बद्ध भारतीय मानक की संख्या	रद्द किए जाने की तिथि
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1.	0071629	स्टील रोलिंग मिल्स प्राफ बंगाल लि., 1 और 2 पुराना कोर्ट, हाउस कार्नर, कलकत्ता-700 001	IS : 226 : 1975	92-09-16
2.	0071730	स्टील रोलिंग मिल्स प्राफ बंगाल लि., 1 और 2 पुराना कोर्ट, हाउस कार्नर, कलकत्ता-700 001	IS : 1977 : 1975	92-09-16
3.	0121618	विश्वेश्वरैया प्रायरेन एंड स्टील लि., भद्रावती-577 301 कर्नाटक	IS : 1875 : 1978	92-07-16
4.	0385349	कुमार प्रायरेन एंड स्टील (प्रा.) लि., 15/ए, एक्सेस्ट बिल्डिंग, 46/ए, चौरंगी रोड, कमरा नं. 15 ए, कलकत्ता-700 081	IS : 226 : 1975	92-09-16
5.	0554144	ऊषा ए लॉय एंड स्टील्स लि., 12/16, नवल गंज, भांगरा-282 006	IS : 226 : 1975	92-10-01
6.	0634849	एडिबल कलर प्रोडक्ट्स डा.—सोनपेन पर तालुक—जवाही, जिला—सतारा, महाराष्ट्र	IS : 5346 : 1975	92-08-16
7.	0730037	गुजरात मिनी स्टील लि., 92, जी आई डी सी एस्टेट, बिनजोल (बटवा), अहमदाबाद	IS : 6914 : 1978	91-11-16
8.	0785264	एलाइड स्टील लि., डा.—तातीबंध, रायपुर 492 001	IS : 6914 : 1978	92-07-16
9.	0789373	करोना कार्बन एंड रिबन कं., 123/32, संधेश बाग, कानपुर 208 012	IS : 4174 : 1977	92-08-16

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
10.	1008021	डोर गैज इंडस्ट्रीज, 228-बी, पीरागढ़ी, नई दिल्ली-110041	IS : 3504 : 1975	89-11-16
11.	1109431	ओरिएन्टल कलर एंड पेन्ट इंडस्ट्रीज (प्रा.) लि., बी 91/92, फेज 1 मायापुरी इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, नई दिल्ली-110 064	IS : 5410 : 1969	92-10-01
12.	1587972	जमा इंडस्ट्रीज, 12 अमानकुखम रोड, पपाकी चकन पलायम, कोयम्बतूर 641 027	IS : 6595 : 1980	92-08-01
13.	1951256	श्रीराम मेटल इंडस्ट्रीज, 48 डी, मधुर स्टेशन रोड, मदुरै-625 009	IS : 10325 : 1989	92-08-01
14.	1898383	यूनिवर्सल इंडस्ट्रीज एंड काटन मिल्स लि., 9/1, आर.एन. मुखर्जी रोड, कलकत्ता-700 001	IS : 226 : 1975	92-09-16
15.	2027636	नेशनल एंड्रो कौमीकल्स, सी-2 इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, पटना-800 013	IS : 4322 : 1967	92-09-16
16.	2101420	यू.पी. एस्बेस्टस लि., मोहन लाल गंज, लखनऊ	IS : 4935 : 1988	92-04-15
17.	2134435	फिसाल फीड्स प्रा. लि., कोठी नं. 561, सैक्टर 16-डी, चंडीगढ़-160 016	IS : 2052 : 1979	92-07-16
18.	2252946	गोदावरी स्टील रि-रोलिंग मिल्स, (प्रो. सैक स्टील रोलिंग मिल्स प्रा. लि.), 41, जे.एम.पी. मार्केट, जलगांव-425 001	IS : 226 : 1975	92-07-01
19.	2262848	कैटल फीड्स फैक्ट्री, चंदा तलवाल, इंदौर-453 771	IS : 2052 : 1979	92-07-16
20.	2274047	समरफिंग इलेक्ट्रिकल्स प्रा. लि., ई-183, कविनगर इंड. एरिया, गाजियाबाद	IS : 11931 : 1987	92-09-01

[सं. के प्र वि/13: 14]

एन. श्रीनिवासन, प्रभार महाविदेश

New Delhi, 4th January, 1993

S.O. 171—In pursuance of sub-regulation (6) of Regulation 5 of the Bureau of Indian Standards (Certification) Regulations, 1988, it is, hereby notified that the Certification Marks Licences, details of which are mentioned in the following Schedule, have expired :

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Licence No.	Name of the Licensee	No. of the relevant Indian Standard	Date of expiry
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1.	0071629	Steel Rolling Mills of Bengal Ltd. 1 & 2 Old Court House Corner Calcutta-700001	IS 226 : 1975	92/09/16
2.	0071730	Steel Rolling Mills of Bengal Ltd. 1 & 2 Old Court House Corner Calcutta-700001	IS 1977 : 1975	92/09/16
3.	0121618	Visvesvaraya Iron & Steel Ltd. Bhadravathi 577301 Karnataka	IS 1875 : 1978	92/07/16
4.	0385349	Kumar Iron & Steel (P) Ltd. 15/A, Everest Building 46/C, Chowringhee Road Room No. 15A, Calcutta-700071	IS 226 : 1975	92/09/16
5.	0554144	Usha Alloys & Steels Ltd. 12/16, Nawalganj Agra-282006	IS 226 : 1975	92/10/01
6.	0634849	Edible colour products At-post-saupane Tal Jawli, Distt. Stara, Maharashtra,	IS 5346 : 1975	92/08/16
7.	0730037	Gujarat Ministeel Ltd. 92, GIDC Estate, Vinzol (Vatwa), Ahmedabad-382445	IS 6914 : 1978	91/11/16
8.	0785264	Allied Steels Ltd. P.O. Tatibandh, Raipur-492001	IS 6914 : 1978	92/07/16
9.	0789373	Carona Carbon & Ribbon Co., 123/32, Sareesh Bagh, Kanpur 208012	IS 4147 : 1977	92/08/16
10.	1008021	Door Mech Industries, 228-B, Peera Garhi, New Delhi-110041	IS 3564 : 1975	89/11/16
11.	1109431	Oriental Colour & Paint Industries(P) Ltd. B-91/92, Phase I, Mayapuri Industrial Area, New Delhi-110064	IS 5410 : 1969	92/10/01
12.	1587972	Uma Industries, 12, Amankulam Road, Pappanai-cken Palayam, Coimbatore-641037	IS 6595 : 1980	92/08/01
13.	1851256	Sri Ram Metal Inds., 46-D, Old East Madurai Stn. Road, Madurai-625009	IS 10325:1989	92/08/01

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
14.	1898383 Universal Industries and Cotton Mills Ltd. 9/1, R.N. Mukherjee Road, Calcutta-700001	IS 226 : 1975		92/09/01
15.	2027636 National Agro Chemicals, C-2, Industrial Area, Patna-800013	IS 4322:1967		92/09/16
16.	2101420 U.P. Asbestos Ltd., Mohanlal Ganj, Lucknow	IS 4985:1988		92/04/15
17.	2134435 Kissan Feeds Pvt. Ltd., Kothi No. 561 Sector 16-D, Chandigarh-160016	IS 2052:1979		92/07/16
18.	2252946 Godavari Steel Re-rolling Mills, (Prop. :SAC Steel Rolling Mills Pvt. Ltd.), 41,JMP Market, Jalgaon-425001	IS 226 : 1975		92/07/01
19.	2262848 Cattle Feed Factory, Chanda Talawali, Manglia, Indore-453771	IS 2052:1979		92/07/16
20.	2274047 Summerking Electricals (P) Ltd., E-183, Kavi Nagar Indl. Area, Ghaziabad.	IS 11951:1987		92/09/01

[No. CMD/13:14]

N. SRINIVASAN, Addl. Dir. General

नई दिल्ली, 4 जनवरी, 1993

का.भा. 272.—भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो (प्रमाणन) विनियम, 1988 के विनियम 5 के उपविनियम (6) के अनुसरण में एतद्वारा अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि जिन प्रमाणन लाइसेंसों के विवरण नीचे दिए गए हैं, उनकी अवधि समाप्त हो गई है :—

अनुसूची

क्र.सं.	लाइसेंस संख्या	लाइसेंसधारी का नाम और पता	सम्बद्ध भारतीय मानक की संख्या	रद्द किए जाने की तिथि
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1.	0231726	ग्रूक बाण्ड इंडिया लि., पो. बा. नं. 6, घटकेसर फैक्ट्री, सिकन्द्राबाद-3	IS : 3309 : 1975	92-03-31
2.	0339948	प्रताप स्टील रोलिंग मिल्स (अमृतसर) प्रा.लि., प्रताप स्टेट, देहरादून-143 105 अमृतसर	IS : 226 : 1975	92-05-15
3.	0391647	रैलिस इंडिया लि., 20 हावड़ा रोड, सालिकिया, हावड़ा-711 106	IS : 2682 : 1984	92-08-15

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
4.	0520632	रैलिम इंडिया लि., 20 हावड़ा रोड, साल्किया, हावड़ा-711 106	IS : 4072 : 1975	92-05-15
5.	0536546	कृष्णा कौमीकल इंडस्ट्रीज, सुजागंज, भागलपुर-812 002	IS : 2597 : 1978	92-07-15
6.	0542238	कृष्णा कौमीकल इंडस्ट्रीज, सुजागंज, भागलपुर-812 002	IS : 561 : 1978	92-07-15
7.	1180841	कामरूप रोलिंग मिल्स, शती जयमोती रोड, अटकॉन, गुवाहाटी-781 001	IS : 226 : 1975	92-06-30
8.	1202118	पिक्म ऑटो, सिसलापुरी गिल रोड, लुधियाना-141 003	IS : 1862 : 1975	92-06-30
9.	1306231	लॉर्ड्स कैमिकल रिसर्च, 12 पिलानी अंधावर स्ट्रीट, चिन्ताड्रिपेट, मद्रास-600 002	IS : 1222 : 1973	92-04-30
10.	1322330	माइक्रो बैंक इंडिया, सोमाधा भवन, नौआपाड़ा औगरोड, बाईलेन, शाम नगर, जिला-24 परगना	IS : 9138 : 1979	92-07-15
11.	1430636	कोरोमंडल इंडस्ट्रीज प्रॉडक्ट्स (इंडिया) प्रा.लि., सुदर्शन बिल्डिंग, 14 ब्लाक रोड, मद्रास-600 014	IS : 8291 : 1976	92-06-30
12.	1451543	पेस्टीसाइड्स, पो. बा. नं. 20, उदयसागर रोड, उदयपुर-313 001	IS : 3284 : 1984	92-09-15
13.	1530842	गयल कंटेनर्स, बी.टी. रोड, खतगढ़, भाहबाद, मारकंडा (हरियाणा)	IS : 10325 : 1989	92-03-15
14.	1560447	मैटल कान्स (इंडिया) प्रा.लि., पो. बा. नं. 73, गम्भीरपुरा, अलीगढ़	IS : 10325 : 1989	92-04-30
15.	1610335	पी.एम. डीजल्स प्रा. लि. अली इंड. एस्टेट, पो. बा. नं. 510, और 1003, राजकोट-360 003	IS : 6595 : 1980	92-02-15
16.	1682663	स्वास्तिक कैमिकल्स एंड पेस्टीसाइड्स, दिसार रोड, रोहतास-124 001	IS : 1307 : 1988	92-04-30
17.	1721748	द्विवार प्रूफिंग इंडस्ट्रीज, नं. 63, नाउंट रोड, गुण्डी, मद्रास-600 032	IS : 2089 : 1977	92-08-15
18.	1841354	इमोर स्टील एन्टरप्राइजेज लि., 14, सामबूदास स्ट्रीट, मद्रास-600 001	IS : 1786 : 1985	92-06-30

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
19	347467	हिन्दुस्तान पुनर्वासाइडिंग लि., 278, कटग पीराव, तिलक बाजार, दिल्ली	IS : 2568 : 1978	92-07-15
20	852682	बहुवर्ती प्लास्टिक प्रा. लि., 41/20-21, साइट 4, इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, साहिबवादा, जिला—गाजियाबाद	IS : 5175 : 1982	92-07-31
21	938672	पालरीवाल ब्रदर्स, ग्राम. के. भट्टाचार्य रोड, पटना-800 001	IS : 11170 : 1985	92-02-15
22	952464	अरुणा टैकनो इंक (इंडिया), 8/2, एन्टोपारिया रोड (दक्षिण), कलकत्ता-700 046	IS : 10 (भाग 4) : 1976	92-03-15
23	931465	एमको इंडस्ट्रियल कारपोरेशन, 18 न्यू कालोनी, माइल बस्ती, नई दिल्ली-110 005	IS : 7142 : 1974	92-03-31
24	1974474	टैकनो पैक लि., सागर 2, एन. सी. वता मरणि, छठा तल, एपार्टमेंट-7, कलकत्ता-700 001	IS : 7406 (भाग 2) : 1984	92-05-15
25	979787	एस यू सवमसेथल एम्स प्रा. लि., जी-25, सेक्टर 11, सीएडा, जिला—गाजियाबाद-201 301	IS : 8034 : 1989	92-05-15
26	1985277	गोपल राडन्स लि., पो. बा. नं. 67, सामगला रोड, बख्सा (पंजाब)-141 401	IS : 2052 : 1979	92-06-15
27	1985378	किरण डेयरा (रज.), 1964-66, जीनव महल, लायकुंआ, दिल्ली-110 006	IS : 2587 : 1963	92-06-15
28	1986380	श्री श्रीनिवास फाउण्ड्री, अम्मानकुलम रोड, कोयम्बर-641 037	IS : 9283 : 1979	92-06-15
29	2002721	किसान एग्रो कैमीकल्स, पो. बा. नं. 248, कोर्ट रोड, मूज्जकरनगर-251 001	IS : 2567 : 1978	92-07-15
30	2002822	किसान एग्रो कैमीकल्स, पो. बा. नं. 248, कोर्ट रोड, मूज्जकरनगर-251 001	IS : 2568 : 1978	92-07-15
31	2003723	एलीमेंट पैकेजिंग इंड प्रा. लि., 96, गार्डनरीच रोड, कलकत्ता-700 023	IS : 7406 (भाग 1) : 1984	92-07-15
32	2053940	एचिड एच वं. कैमीकल लि., 6230-6231 और 6215 जीआईसी ईड, एस्टेट, अंकनेश्वर-393 002	IS : 8074 : 1983	92-08-31
33	2101420	यूपी एस्वेन्टस लि., मोहनलाल गंज, लखनऊ	IS : 4985 : 1988	92-04-15

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
34.	2103727	दिल्ली ग्रायरन एंड स्टील कं. (प्रा.) लि., 4/1, ग्रासफ झली रोड, नई दिल्ली	IS : 1786 : 1985	92-04-15
35.	2117637	पंजाब पेस्टीसाइड्स इंड. कॉर्पोरेटिव सोसाइटी प्रा. लि., ग्राम—खानपुर, तहसील—खरार-140 301	IS : 561 : 1978	92-05-15
36.	2118538	गणि रबड़ फोम इंडस्ट्रीज, डब्ल्यू जैड, नारायणा ग्राम, नई दिल्ली-110 028	IS : 1741 : 1960	92-05-31
37.	2131025	पशुपात उद्योग लि., 23-ए, एन एस रोड, 4था तल, कमरा नं. 6, कलकत्ता-700 001	IS : 3975 : 1988	92-07-15
38.	2138443	युनिमिन इंडिया लि., 5 कम्युनिटी सेन्टर, बसंत लोक, पहला तल, बसंत बिहार, नई दिल्ली-11 0 057	IS : 4985 : 1988	92-07-31
39.	2140127	दि मॉडर्न कंस्ट्रक्शन कं. लि., 63, कक्षोपलायन, त्रिशी रोड, कोयम्बतूर-641 402	IS : 3589 : 1981	92-07-31
40.	2147343	इंस्ट्रियल पेन्स एंड वार्निशेज, 15, स्नेह नगर, मैन रोड, इन्दौर-452 001	IS : 2074 : 1979	92-08-31
41.	2190950	जम्मू इस्पात प्रा. लि., लेन नं. 2, फेज 2, सिछको इंड० काम्प्लेक्स, बारी ब्राह्मण, जम्मू	IS : 1239(भाग 1) : 1979	92-07-31
42.	2216336	प्रीमियर विनाइल फ्लोरींग लि., सफदरजंग इंड. एरिया, नई दिल्ली-110 016	IS : 3462 : 1986	92-03-31
43.	2230532	भारुति मेटल्स, 2-सी मिनी रोड, टीक रोड, बंधप (पश्चिम), बम्बई-400 078	IS : 1703 : 1977	92-03-31
44.	2247448	ब्रह्मपुत्र स्टील्स प्रा. लि., 24, ए.टी. रोड, बारलूमूर, गुवाहाटी-781 009	IS : 6914 : 1978	92-05-31
45.	2261240	थेकसम कारपोरेशन (प्रा.) लि., लाकर बिल्डिंग, अरिथंग रोड, गंटोक (मिक्किम)—727 101	IS : 10325 : 1989	92-07-15
46.	2275857	माउथर्न इंसेक्टीसाइड्स एंड फटिलाइजर्स, पो. नं. 490, 3रा तल, पारमन-कामशियल काम्प्लेक्स, जैमिनी स्टुडियो कैम्पस, मद्रास-680 006	IS : 561 : 1978	92-08-31

New Delhi, the 4th January, 1993

S.O. 272.— In pursuance of sub-regulation (6) of regulation 5 of the Bureau of Indian Standards (Certification) Regulations, 1988, it is, hereby notified that the Certification Marks Licences, details of which are mentioned in the following Schedule, have expired:

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Licence No.	Name of the licensee	No. of the relevant Indian Standards	Date of expiry
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	
1	0231726	Brooke Bond India Ltd. P.B. No. 6. Ghatkesar Factory Secunderabad 3.	IS 3309:1975	92/03/31
2	0339948	Partap Steel Rolling Mills (Amritsar) Pvt. Ltd. Partap Estate Chheharta 143105 (Amritsar)	IS 226 : 1975	92/05/15
3	0391647	Rallis India Ltd. 20, Howrah Road, Salkia, Howrah 711106	IS 2682:1984	92/08/15
4	0520632	Partap Steel Rolling Mills (Amritsar) Pvt. Ltd. Partap Estate Chheharta 143105 (Amritsar)	IS 4072 : 1975	92/05/15
5	0536546	Krishna Chemical Industries Sujaganj, Bhagalpur 812002	IS 2567 : 1978	92/07/15
6	0542238	Krishna Chemical Industries Sujaganj Bhagalpur 812002	IS 561 : 1978	92/07/15
7	1108041	Kamrup Rolling Mills Sati Jaimoti Road Attagaon Gauhati 781001	IS 226 : 1975	92/06/30
8	1202118	Picks Auto Inds. Simla Puri Gill Road. Ludhiana 141003	IS 1862 : 1975	92/06/30
9	1306231	Lord's Chemical Research 12, Palani Andavar Street Chintadripet Madras 600002	IS 1222 : 1973	92/04/30
10	1322330	Micro Bac India Promada Bhawan Noapara OGG Road By Lane Sham Nagar, Distt. 24 Parganas	IS 9138 : 1979	92/07/15
11	1430636	Coromandel Indag Products India (Pvt) Ltd. Sudarsan Building 13, Whites Road. Madras 600014	IS 8291:1976	92/06/30
12	1451543	Pesticides India P.B. No. 20 Udaisagar Road Udaipur 313001	IS 3284:1984	92/09/15
13	1530842	Royal Containers G.T. Road Rattangarh Shahbad Markanda Haryana	IS 10325:1989	92/03/15
14	1560447	Metal Cans (India) Pvt. Ltd. P.O. Box 73 Gambhir Pura, Aligarh.	IS 10325:1989	92/04/30

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
15 1610335	P.M. Diesels Pvt. Ltd. AJI Indl. Estate P.N. No. 510 and 1003 Rajkot 360003	IS 6595:1980	92/03/15
16 1682663	Swastik Chemicals & Pesticides Hissar Road Rohtak 124001	IS 1307 : 1988	92/04/30
17 1721748	Hatari Proofing Inds. No. 63, Mount Road, Guindy, Madras 600032	IS 2089:1977	92/08/15
18 1841354	Endore Steel Enterprises Ltd. 14, Semvudoss Street Madras 600001	IS 1786 : 1985	92/06/30
19 1847467	Hindusian Pulversising Mills 278, Katra Peran Tilak Bazar, Delhi.	IS 2563:1978	92/07/15
20 1852662	Bhubali Plastics Pvt. Ltd. 41/20-21, Site 4 Industrial Area Sahibabad. Distt. Ghazialud.	IS 5157:1982	92/07/31
21 1938672	Palriwal Brothers R.K. Bhattacharya Road. Patna 800001	IS 11170:1985	92/02/15
22 1952464	Alpha Techno Inds (India) 8/2A Topria Road (South) Calicut 700046	IS 10(Part 4):1976	92/03/15
23 1961465	ASCO Industrial Corporation 18, New Colony Model Basti New Delhi 110005.	IS 7142:1974	92/03/31
24 1974474	Techno Pack Ltd. Sagar Estate, 2 N.C. Dutta Sarani 6th Floor APT-7 Calcutta 700601	IS 7406(Part2):1984	92/05/15
25 1979787	S.U. Submersibiel Pumps Pvt. Ltd. G-25 Sector 11 Noida Distt. Ghaziabad 201301	IS 8034:1989	92/05/15
26 1985277	Goyal Rice Mills Post Box No. 67 Sanrala Road Khanna (Punjab) 141401	IS 2052:1979	92/06/15
27 1985378	Keeran Dairy (Regd) 1964-66 Ziat Mahal Lal Kuan Delhi 110006.	IS 2557:1963	92/06/15
28 1986380	Sree Srinivasassa Foundry Ammankulam Road Coimbatore 641037	IS 9283:1979	92/06/15
29 2002721	Kissan Agro Chemicals P.B.No. 248, Court Road Muzaffarnagar 251001	IS 2567:1978	92/07/15
30 2002822	Kissan Agro Chemicals P.B.No. 248, Court Road Muzaffarnagz 251001	IS 2568:1978	92/07/15

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
31 2003723	Elegant Packaging Inds. Pvt. Ltd. 96 Garden Reach Road Calcutta 700023	IS 7406 (Part 1):1984	92/07/15
32 2053940	Evid & Co. Chemical Ltd. 6230-6231 & 6215, GIDC Indl. Estate Ankeshwar 393002	IS 8074:1983	92/08/31
33 2101420	U.P. Asbestos Ltd. Mohalal Ganj Lucknow	IS 4985:1988	92/04/15
34 2103727	Delhi Iron & Steel Co. (P) Ltd. 44, Asaf Ali Road New Delhi.	IS 1786:1985	92/04/15
35 2117637	Punjab Pesticides Indl. Co-op Society Pvt. Ltd. Village Khanpur Tehsil Kharar 140301	IS 561:1978	92/05/15
36 2118538	Shashi Rubber Foam Industries WZ-550 Naraina Village New Delhi-110028	IS 1741:1960	92/05/31
37 2131025	Pashupati Udyog Ltd. 23-A, N.S. Road 4th Floor Room No. 6. Calcutta 700001	IS 3975:1988	92/07/15
38 2138443	Unimin India Ltd. 5, Community Centre Vasant Lok 1st Floor Vasant Vihar New Delhi-110057	IS 4985:1988	92/07/31
39 2140127	The Modern Construction Co. Ltd. 63, Kannampalayam Trichy Road, Coimbatore 641402	IS 3589:1981	92/07/31
40 2147343	Industrial Paints & Varnishes 15 Sneh Nagar Main Road Indore-452001	IS 2074:1979	92/08/31
41 2190950	Jammu Ispat Pvt. Ltd. Lane No. 2, Phase II SIDCO Indl. Complex. Baji Brahmana Jammu	IS 1239(Part 1): 1979	92/07/31
42 2216336	Premier Vendle Flooring Ltd. Safdarjang Dev. Area New Delhi 110016	IS 3462:1986	92/03/31
43 2230532	Maruti Metals 2-C, Mini Land Tank Road Bhandup (W) Bombay 400078	IS 1703:1977	92/03/31
44 2247448	Brahmaputra Steels Pvt. Ltd. 24 A.T. Road Bharalumukh Guwahati 781009	IS 6914:1978	92/05/31
45 2261240	Theksum Corpn. (P) Ltd. Lakar Building Arithang Road Gangtok (Sikkim) 737101	IS 10325:1989	92/07/15
46 2275857	Southern Insecticides & Fertilizers P.B. No. 490, 3rd Floor Parsn-Commercial Complex Gemini Studio Campus Madras 600006	IS 561:1978	92/08/31

कोयला मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 11 जनवरी, 1993

का.आ. 273—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने कोयलाधारक क्षेत्र (अर्जन और विकास) अधिनियम, 1957 (1957 का 20) (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) की धारा 7 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन जारी की गई और भारत के राजपत्र भाग II, खंड 3, उप खंड (ii) तारीख 12 अक्तूबर, 1991 के पृष्ठ 3895 से 3908 पर प्रकाशित भारत सरकार के कोयला मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं. का. आ. 2566 तारीख 1 अक्तूबर, 1991 द्वारा उक्त अधिसूचना में संलग्न अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि का अर्जन करने के धपने आशय की सूचना दी थी ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार की जानकारी में यह बात लाई गई है कि उक्त अधिसूचना के राजपत्र में प्रकाशन के समय मुद्रण संबंधी कुछ गलतियां हो गई हैं ;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिसूचना में संलग्न अनुसूची का निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है :—

पृष्ठ 3895 पर—

1. अधिसूचना के टिप्पण-1 में "बैस्टन कोलफील्ड्स हाउस स्ट्रीट लिमिटेड" के स्थान पर "बैस्टन कोलफील्ड्स लिमिटेड" पढ़ें।

पृष्ठ 3896 पर—

2. ग्राम मथनी में अर्जित किए जाने वाले प्लाट संख्याक शीर्षक के अंतर्गत "321 भाग" के स्थान पर "329 भाग" पढ़ें।
3. सीमा वर्णन में रेखा ख—ग—घ—ङ में "प्लाट संख्याक 334, 333/1 से बाहर" के स्थान पर "प्लाट संख्याक 334, 333/1 में से होकर 333/2 की बाहरी सीमा के साथ-साथ जाती है और" पढ़ें और "प्लाट संख्याक 332, 331, 329, 328, 327, 301, 302, 303, 304, 298 की बाहरी सीमा के साथ-साथ चलती हुई" के स्थान पर "प्लाट संख्याक 332, 331, 329, 328, 327, 301, 302, 303, 304, 298 में से होती हुई" पढ़ें।

4. रेखा ज—झ में "प्लाट संख्याक 35, 36/1" के स्थान पर "प्लाट संख्याक 35, 36/1, 33" पढ़ें।

5. अनुसूची में "कुल गमस्त अधिकारी क्षेत्र" शब्दों के स्थान पर "कुल गमस्त अधिकार क्षेत्र" पढ़ें।

पृष्ठ 3897 पर—

6. "ग्राम मिरागोरीकला में अर्जित किए जाने वाले प्लाट संख्याक" शीर्षक के अंतर्गत "154/1/2/3 भाग" के स्थान पर "154/1/2/3 भाग" पढ़ें।
7. सीमा वर्णन में—रेखा कख में "18" के स्थान पर "28" पढ़ें।
8. रेखा खड़ में "ग्राम मिरागोरी कला" के स्थान पर "ग्राम मिरागोरी कला" पढ़ें।

9. रेखा थ—दध—न' "154, 123" के स्थान पर "154 1/2/3" पढ़ें और "63" के स्थान पर "64" पढ़ें।

10. रेखा य—क 1 में "38" के स्थान पर "388" पढ़ें।
पृष्ठ 3898 पर—

11. सीमा वर्णन में रेखा क 1 ख 1 में "रेखा मंडली" के स्थान पर "रेखा मंडला" पढ़ें।
पृष्ठ 3900 पर—

12. रेखा ड—घ—ग—ख—क—ट—1 में "1" के स्थान पर "11" पढ़ें और "ठ" के स्थान पर "ट 1" पढ़ें।

13. रेखा ण—ढ—ड में "771/" के स्थान पर "77/1" पढ़ें।

14. रेखा म—म—1 "आरम्भ किन्वाडु" के स्थान पर "आरम्भिक बिन्दु स 1" पढ़ें।
पृष्ठ 3901 पर—

15. रेखा द—घ में "घ" के स्थान पर "ध" पढ़ें।

[संख्या 43015/9/89—एल एस डब्ल्यू]

बी बी राव, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF COAL

New Delhi, the 11th January, 1993

S.O. 273.—Whereas by the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Coal number S.O. 2566, dated the 1st October, 1991, published in the Gazette of India, dated the 12th October, 1991, in Part-II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii) at pages 3895 to 3908, issued under sub-section (1) of section 7 of the Coal Bearing Areas (Acquisition and Development) Act, 1957 (20 of 1957) (hereinafter referred to as the said Act), the Central Government gave notice of its intention to acquire the lands described in the Schedule appended to that notification;

And whereas it has been brought to the notice of the Central Government that certain errors of printing nature have occurred in the publication of the said notification in the Official Gazette;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 7 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby amends the Schedule appended to the said notification as follows :—

- at page 3902, in Note 2 of the notification, in explanation to section 6(1) of the aforesaid Act, for "sector" read "section";
- at page 3903, in the boundary description, in line L-B, for "NB" read "B";
- at page 3904, in the boundary description, in line g-h-i, for "72" read "52";
- at page 3906, in the boundary description, in line I-H, for line heading "I-H" read "I-h" and for "H" read "h";
in line H-G-I-E, for line heading "H-G-I-E" read "h-g-i-e" and for "E" read "e";
in line E-D-C-B-A-KI, for line heading "E-D-C-B-A-KI" read "e-d-c-b-a-ki" and "KI" read "k-I";
in line KI-JI-II-P, for line heading "KI-JI-II-P" read "ki-ji-il-p";
- at page 3907, in the boundary description, in line YI-K-I-M for line heading "YI-K-I-M" read "YI-k-i-m" and for "point M" read "point 'm'";
in line R-Q for line heading "R-Q" read "r-q";
- at page 3908, in line V-P-Q- for line heading "V-P-Q" read "v-p-q" and for "Q" read "q";
in line Q-R for line heading "Q-R" read "q-r" and for "R" read "r".

[No. 43015/9/89-LSW]
B. B. RAO, Under Secy.

मानव संसाधन विकास विभाग
(महिला एवं बाल विकास विभाग)

प्रां विन्यास अधिनियम, 1890 (1890 का 6) के मामले में
राष्ट्रीय बाल कोष, नई दिल्ली के मामले में
नई दिल्ली, 12 जनवरी, 1993

का.आ. 274—राष्ट्रीय बाल कोष, नई दिल्ली के प्रबन्ध बोर्ड द्वारा किए आवेदन पर और उनकी सहमति से पूर्व विन्यास अधिनियम, 1890 (1890 का 6) के खण्ड 10(2) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा आदेश देती है कि नीचे दिए गए ब्योरे के अनुसार रु. 96,35,692 (छियात्तवे लाख, पैंतीस हजार छः सौ बत्तरे मात्र) (एक करोड़ की छूट कीमत की राशि) स्टेट बैंक ऑफ इंडिया, संसद मार्ग, नई दिल्ली में मॉर्टिगिजेंट ऑन डिपॉजिट योजना में 15% की ब्याज दर पर 3 महीनों के लिए 27-10-92 को पुनः निवेश की गई:

क्रम सं.	राशि	पिछले निवेश की तारीख	भुगतान की तारीख	अभियुक्तियां
1	1,00,00,000	25-07-92	26-10-92	बची हुई राशि सिडिकोट बैंक, हाउस खास, नई दिल्ली में 3 महीनों के लिए फिक्स डिपॉजिट योजना में जमा कराई जायेगी।

2. भारत सरकार के तत्कालीन समाज कल्याण विभाग के दिनांक 2 मार्च, 1979 के समरन्मय पर यथा मंजोधित सा.था. 120(ई) की अधिसूचना के साथ प्रकाशित राष्ट्रीय बाल कोष, नई दिल्ली के संचालन की योजना के अनुसार प्रयोग किए जाने हेतु उपरोक्त खाता भारतीय पूर्व विन्यास के खर्चांची के नाम होगा।

[सं. 13-4/92-टी.आर.- II]

प्रेम सागर, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT
(Department of Women & Child Development)

IN THE MATTER OF THE CHARITABLE ENDOWMENTS ACT, 189 (6 of 1890)

IN THE MATTER OF THE NATIONAL CHILDREN'S FUND, NEW DELHI

New Delhi, the 12th January, 1993

S.O. 274.—On the application made by and with the concurrence of the Board of Management of the National Children's Fund, New Delhi, as in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 10(2) of the Charitable Endowments Act, 1890 (6 of 1890), the Central Government do hereby order that the sum of Rs. 96,35,692 (Ninety six lakh thirty five thousand six hundred and ninety two only) [discounted value of Rs. 1,00,00,000] as per particulars given below be reinvested in Certificate of Deposit Scheme for three months in State Bank of India, Main Branch, Sansad Marg, New Delhi at the rate of Interest of 15% per annum w.e.f. 26-10-92.

Sl. No.	Amount	Date of previous Investment	Date of Maturity	Remarks
1.	1,00,00,000/-	25-07-92	26-10-92	Surplus amount will be deposited in FD for 3 months in Syndicate Bank, Hauz Khas, New Delhi.

2. The above account shall vest in the treasurer of charitable endowments of India to be held by him for being applied in accordance with the scheme for the administration of the National Children's Fund, New Delhi, published with the Notification of the Government of India in the Department of Social Welfare No. S.O. 120 (E) dated the 2nd March, 1979 as amended from time to time.

[F. No. 13-4/92-TR-II]

PREM SAGAR, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 12 जनवरी, 1993

का.आ. 275—राष्ट्रीय बाल कोष, नई दिल्ली के प्रबन्धन बोर्ड द्वारा किए आवेदन पर और उनकी सहमति से पूर्व विन्यास अधिनियम 1890 (1890 का 6) के खण्ड (2) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा आदेश देती है कि नीचे दिए गए ब्योरे के अनुसार रु. 48,19,757 (अड़ताली लाख उन्नीस हजार सात सौ सत्तावन मात्र) पचास लाख

की छूट कीमत की राशि) विजया बैंक, चांदनी चौक, नई दिल्ली में सर्टिफिकेट ऑफ डिपॉजिट योजना में 15% की ब्याज दर पर 91 दिनों के लिए 7-11-92 को पुनः निवेश की गई-

क्रम सं.	राशि	पिछले निवेश की तारीख	भुगतान की तारीख	अभियंतियों
1.	45,00,000	08-08-92	07-11-92	
2.	1,72,620 (1,77,784 भुगतान तारीख के बाद प्राप्त राशि)	08-08-92	07-11-92	
3.	1,41,973			राष्ट्रीय बाल कोष के पास उपलब्ध बचाया रोकड़ में से।

2. भारत सरकार के तत्कालीन समाज कल्याण विभाग के दिनांक 2 मार्च, 1979 के समय-समय पर यथा संशोधित सां. आ. 120(ई) की अधिसूचना के साथ प्रकाशित राष्ट्रीय बाल कोष, नई दिल्ली के संचालन की योजना के अनुसार प्रयोग किए जाने हेतु उपरोक्त खाता भारतीय पूर्त विन्यास के खजांची के नाम होगा।

[सं. 13-4/92-टी.आर.-II]

प्रेम सागर, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 12th January, 1993

S.O. 275.—On the application made by and with the concurrence of the Board of Management of the National Children's Fund, New Delhi, as in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 10 (2) of the Charitable Endowments Act 1890 (6 of 1890), the Central Government do hereby order that the sum of Rs. 48,19,757 (Rupees forty eight lakhs nineteen thousand seven hundred fifty seven only) (discounted value of Rs. 50,00,000) as per particulars given below the re-invested in Certificate of Deposit Scheme for 91 days in Vijaya Bank, Chandni Chowk, Delhi at the rate of Interest of 15% per annum w.e.f. 07-11-92.

Sl. No.	Amount	Date of previous Investment	Date of Maturity	Remarks
1.	45,00,000	08-08-92	07-11-92	
2.	1,72,620/- (1,77,784/- maturity value)	08-08-92	07-11-92	
3.	1,41,973/-			Cash balance from NCF.

2. The above account shall vest in the treasurer of charitable endowments of India to be held by him for being applied in accordance with the scheme for the administration of the National Children's Fund, New Delhi, published with the Notification of the Government of India in the then Department of Social Welfare No. S.O. 120 (E) dated the 2nd March, 1979 as amended from time to time.

[F. No. 13-4/92-TR-II]

PREM SAGAR, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 12 जनवरी, 1993

सां. आ. 276.—राष्ट्रीय बाल कोष, नई दिल्ली के प्रबंध बोर्ड द्वारा किए आवेदन पर और उनकी सहमति से पूर्व विन्यास अधिनियम 1890 (1890 का 6) के खण्ड 4 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एन.डी.आर. द्वारा आदेश देती है कि नीचे दिए गए व्योरे के अनुसार रु. 3,64,308 रु. (तीन लाख चौस हजार तीन सौ मात्र) की राशि निडिकेट बैंक, हाऊस खाम, नई दिल्ली में 3 महीनों के लिए फिक्स डिपॉजिट योजना के अन्तर्गत 11.5 प्रतिशत की ब्याज दर से निवेश की गई:—

क्रम सं.	राशि	पिछले निवेश की तारीख	भुगतान की तारीख	अभियंतियों
1.	3,64,308	25-07-92	26-10-92	स्टेट बैंक ऑफ मैसूर तथा विजया बैंक, चांदनी चौक, में एक कोड़ छूट कीमत में से अनिवार्य राशि।

2. भारत सरकार के तत्कालीन समाज कल्याण विभाग के दिनांक 2 मार्च, 1979 के समय-समय पर यथा संशोधित सा.आ. 120(ई) की अधिसूचना के साथ प्रकाशित राष्ट्रीय बाल कोष, नई दिल्ली के संचालन की योजना के अनुसार प्रयोग किए जाने हेतु उपरोक्त खाता भारतीय पूर्त विन्यास के खजांची के नाम होगा।

[सं. 13-4/92 टी. आर.-II]

प्रेम सागर, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 12th January, 1993

S.O. 276.—On the application made by and with the concurrence of the Board of Management of the National Children's Fund, New Delhi, as in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 4 of the Charitable Endowments Act 1890 (6 of 1890), the Central Government do hereby order that the sum of Rs. 3,64,308 (Rupees Three lakhs sixty four thousand three hundred & eight only) as per particulars given below be invested in Fixed Deposit Scheme for 3 months in Syndicate Bank, Hauz Khas, New Delhi at the rate of Interest 11.5% per annum w.e.f. 26-10-92.

Sl. No.	Amount	Date of previous Investment	Date of Maturity	Remarks
1.	3,64,308/-	25-07-92	26-10-92	Surplus amount of discounted value of Rs. 1,00,00,000/- deposited in (i) Vijaya Bank, Chandni Chowk, N.D. (ii) State Bank of Mysore, Connaught Place, N.D.

2. The above account shall vest in the treasurer of charitable endowments of India to be held by him for being applied in accordance with the Scheme for the administration of the National Children's Fund, New Delhi, published with the Notification of the Government of India in the then Department of Social Welfare No. S.O. 120 (E) dated the 2nd March, 1979 as amended from time to time.

[F. No. 13-4/92-TR-II]
PREM SAGAR, Under Secy.

जल संसाधन मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 1 फरवरी, 1993

का.आ. 277 :- बेतवा नदी बोर्ड अधिनियम, 1976 (1976 का 63), की धारा 4 के परन्तुक द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार बेतवा नदी बोर्ड में मध्य प्रदेश और उत्तर प्रदेश का प्रतिनिधित्व करने के लिए निम्नलिखित की नियुक्ति [उस समय तक के लिए की जाती है जब तक कि मध्य प्रदेश और उत्तर प्रदेश राज्य संविधान के अनुच्छेद-356 के अंतर्गत राष्ट्रपति शासन के अधीन रहते हैं]।

मध्य प्रदेश	उत्तर प्रदेश
1. राज्य के राज्यपाल	1. राज्य के राज्यपाल
2. सलाहकार, जल संसाधन एवं विद्युत	2. सलाहकार, सिंचाई एवं विद्युत
3. सलाहकार, वित्त	3. सलाहकार, वित्त।

[सं. 10/46/92-पी-II]
सी.डी. शर्मा, सचिव

MINISTRY OF WATER RESOURCES

New Delhi, the 1st February, 1993

S.O. 277.—In exercise of the powers conferred by proviso to Section 4 of the Betwa River Board Act, 1976 (No. 63 of 1976), the Central Government hereby appoints the following to represent Madhya Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh on the Betwa River Board till the States of Madhya Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh are under President's Rule under Article 356 of the Constitution :

Madhya Pradesh

Uttar Pradesh

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1. Governor of the State | 1. Governor of the State |
| 2. Advisor, Water Resources and Power | 2. Advisor, Irrigation and Power |
| 3. Advisor, Finance | 3. Advisor, Finance |

[No. 10/46/92-P. II]
C. D. THATTE, Secy.

स्वास्थ्य और परिवार कल्याण मंत्रालय

(स्वास्थ्य विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 14 जनवरी 1993

का.आ. 278.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) नियम, 1976 के नियम 10 के उप-नियम (4) के अनुसरण में स्वास्थ्य और परिवार कल्याण मंत्रालय के नियंत्रणाधीन निम्नलिखित कार्यालय को, जिसके 80% से अधिक कर्मचारियों ने हिन्दी का कार्यसाधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है, अधिसूचित करती है :-

“मलेरिया अनुसंधान केन्द्र, दिल्ली।”

[संख्या ई-11012/8/91-रा.भा. कार्य.]

आई.एस. बिष्ट, संयुक्त सचिव

MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE

(Department of Health)

New Delhi, the 14th January, 1993

S.O. 278.—In pursuance of sub-rule (4) of Rule 10 of the Official Language, (Use for Official Purposes of the Union) Rules, 1976, the Central Government hereby notifies the following office under the Ministry of Health & Family Welfare, 80 per cent staff whereof have acquired working knowledge of Hindi :-

‘Malaria Research Centre, Delhi’.

[No. E-11012/8/91-OLI]

I. S. BIST, Jr. Secy.

शहरी विकास मंत्रालय

(दिल्ली प्रभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 21 जनवरी, 1993

का.आ. 279.—यह निम्नांकित क्षेत्रों के बारे में कुछ संशोधन, जिन्हें केन्द्रीय सरकार अध्यावर्णित क्षेत्रों के बारे में दिल्ली बृहद् योजना/क्षेत्रीय विकास योजना में प्रस्तावित करती है तथा जिसे दिल्ली विकास अधिनियम, 1957 (1957 का 61) की धारा 44 के प्रावधानों के अनुसार दिनांक 14-07-92 के नोटिस संख्या एफ.-16 (10) 86-एम.पी. द्वारा प्रकाशित किये गये थे जिसमें उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 11-क की उपधारा (3) में अपेक्षित आपत्तियों/सुझाव, उक्त नोटिस की तारीख के 30 दिन की अवधि में आमंत्रित किए गए थे।

और यतः प्रस्तावित संशोधन के बारे में कोई आपत्तियों और मुझाव प्राप्त नहीं हुए हैं।

और यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार ने दिल्ली वृद्ध योजना/क्षेत्रीय विकास योजना में संशोधन करने का निर्णय किया है।

अतः अब केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 11-क को उपधारा (2) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, भारत के राजपत्र में इस अधिसूचना के प्रकाशन की तारीख में दिल्ली की उक्त वृद्ध योजना में एनद्वारा निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है :—

संशोधन :

जोन डी-4 के अंतर्गत आने वाले और उत्तर में महादेव रोड, पूर्व में आकाशवाणी भवन, पश्चिम में ए.आई.आर. के साथ 60 फुट चौड़ी सड़क के धिरे लगभग 1.01 हेक्टेयर (2.5 एकड़) क्षेत्र को भूमि उपयोगी "आवासीय" से "सरकारी कार्यालयों" में परिवर्तित किया जाना प्रस्तावित है।

[सं. के-12016/6/88-डी डीव/1बी]

एम.सी. सागर, अवसर सचिव

MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT

(Delhi Division)

New Delhi, the 12th January, 1993

S.O. 279.—Whereas certain modifications, which the Central Government proposes to make in the Master Plan for Delhi/Zonal Development Plan regarding the areas mentioned hereunder were published vide Notice No. F. 16(10) 86-MP dated 14-7-92 in accordance with the provisions of Section 44 of the Delhi Development Act, 1957 (61 of 1957) inviting objections/suggestions as required by sub-section (3) of Section 11-A of the said Act, within thirty days from the date of the said Notice;

And whereas no objections and suggestions have been received with regard to the said proposed modification;

And whereas the Central Government have decided to modify the Master Plan for Delhi/Zonal Development Plan:

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of Section 11-A of the said Act, the Central Government hereby makes the following modification in the said Master Plan for Delhi with effect from the date of publication of this Notification in the Gazette of India.

MODIFICATION

"The land use of an area measuring about 1.01 hect. (2.5 acres) falling in zone D-4 and bounded by Mahadeva Road in the North, All India Radio Building in the East, and 60' wide road along AIR and the West is proposed to be change from 'residential' to 'Govt. Offices'."

[No. K-12016/6/88-DDVA/IB]

S. C. SAGAR, Under Secy

सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 28 दिसम्बर, 1992

का.प्रा. 280—चलचित्र (प्रमाणीकरण) नियम

1983 के नियम 7 और 8 के साथ पठित चलचित्र अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 37) की धारा 5 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए तथा इस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचनाओं (i) सं. 809/5/91-एफ (सी)

दिनांक 30-9-91 (ii) सं. 809/9/92-एफ (सी) दिनांक 15-5-92, (iii) सं. 809/9/92-एफ (सी) दिनांक 27-8-92 और (iv) सं. 809/9/92-एफ (सी) दिनांक 22-9-92 के अनुक्रम में केन्द्रीय सरकार श्रीमती विमला वासुदेवा राव को तत्काल प्रभाव से अगले आदेशों तक केन्द्रीय फिल्म प्रमाणीकरण बोर्ड के मद्रास सलाहकार पैनल का सदस्य नियुक्त करती है।

[फाइल नं. 809/9/92-एफ (सी)]

एस. लक्ष्मीनारायणन, संयुक्त सचिव

MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING

New Delhi, the 28th December, 1992

S.O. 280.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 5 of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 (37 of 1952) read with rules 7 and 8 of the Cinematograph (Certification) Rules 1983 and in continuation of this Ministry's Notification (i) No. 809/5/91-F(C) dated 30-9-91, (ii) No. 809/9/92-F(C) dated 15-5-92, (iii) No. 809/9/92-F(C) dated 27-8-92 and (iv) No. 809/9/92-F(C) dated 22-9-92, the Central Government is pleased to appoint Smt. Vimla Vasudeva Rao, as member of the Madras Advisory Panel of the Central Board of Film Certification with immediate effect and until further orders.

[File No. 809/9/92-F(C)]

S. LAKSHMI NARAYANAN, Jt. Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 30 दिसम्बर, 1992

का.प्रा. 281 :—चलचित्र (प्रमाणीकरण) नियम, 1983 के नियम 7 और 8 के साथ पठित चलचित्र अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 37) की धारा 5 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए तथा इस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचनाओं (1) संख्या 809/3/91-एफ (सी) दिनांक 30-9-91, (2) संख्या 809/1/92-एफ (सी) दिनांक 24-8-92, (3) संख्या 809/1/92-एफ (सी) दिनांक 26-8-92 और (4) संख्या 809/1/92-एफ (सी) दिनांक 7-10-1992 के अनुक्रम में केन्द्रीय सरकार निम्नलिखित व्यक्तियों को तत्काल प्रभाव से अगले आदेशों तक केन्द्रीय फिल्म प्रमाणीकरण बोर्ड बम्बई सलाहकार पैनल का सदस्य नियुक्त करती है :—

1. श्री प्रभाकर कसौलकर,
2. श्री सुरेन्द्र फर्नांडो,
3. श्री सुरेश वाल्हे
4. प्रोफेसर अम्बादास चार्ड. मोहिते

[फाइल संख्या 809/1/92-एफ (सी)]

एस. लक्ष्मीनारायणन, संयुक्त सचिव

New Delhi, the 30th December, 1992

S.O. 281.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 5 of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 (37 of 1952), read with rules 7 and 8 of the Cinematograph (Certification) Rules, 1983 and in continuation of this Ministry's Notifications (i) No. 809/3/91-F(C) dated 30-9-91, (ii) No. 809/1/92-F(C), dated 24-8-92, (iii) No. 809/1/92-F(C), dated 26-8-92 and (iv) No. 809/1/92-F(C), dt. 7-10-92 the Central Government is pleased to appoint the following persons as members of the Bombay advisory panel of the Central Board of Film Certification with immediate effect and until further orders :—

1. Shri Prabhakar Kasulkar,
2. Shri Surendra Furtado,
3. Shri Suresh Walve,
4. Prof Ambadas Y. Mohite.

[File No. 809/1/92-F(C)]

S. LAKSHMI NARAYANAN, Jt. Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 14 जनवरी, 1993

का.आ. 282:—चलचित्र (प्रमाणन) नियम, 1983 के नियम 7 और 8 के साथ पठित चलचित्र अधिनियम 1952 (1952 का 37) की धारा 5 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और इस मंत्रालय की दिनांक 30-9-91 की अधिसूचना संख्या 809/7/91-एफ (सी) के अनुक्रम में, केन्द्रीय सरकार श्री के.पी. उदय भानु, 4/1821, पंडित कालोनी, कोटियार, तिरुवनन्तपुरम और प्रो. थुम्पामन थामस, पुथेनपुराईन, पालियेकारा, तिरुवाला को तत्काल प्रभाव से अगले आदेशों तक केन्द्रीय फिल्म प्रमाणीकरण बोर्ड, तिरुवनन्तपुरम, के सहायकार पैनल का सदस्य नियुक्त करती है।

[फाइल सं 809/6/92-एफ (सी)]

विजय कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th January, 1993

S.O. 282.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 5 of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 (37 of 1952) read with rules 7 and 8 of the Cinematograph (Certification) Rules, 1983 and in continuation of this Ministry's notification No. 809/7/91-F(C) dated 30-9-91, the Central Government is pleased to appoint Shri K. P. Udaya Bhanu, 4/1821 Pandit Colony, Kowdiar, Thiruvananthapuram, and Prof. Thumpamon Thomas, Puthenpurayil, Paliyekkara, Tiruvalla, as members of the Thiruvananthapuram advisory panel of the Central Board of Film Certification with immediate effect and until further orders.

[File No. 809/6/92-F(C)]

VIJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

नागर विमानन और पर्यटन मंत्रालय

(नागर विमानन विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 12 जनवरी, 1993

का.आ. 283:—इन मंत्रालय की दिनांक 16-10-1992 की इसी संख्या की अधिसूचना में आंशिक पशोधन करते हुए, 27-8-1992 को दिल्ली में स्थानीय उड़ान करते समय सीमा सुरक्षा बल बीच क्राफ्ट सुपर किंग विमान बी.टी.-ई.ओ.ए. का दुर्घटना की जांच करने के लिए एयर कमीडोर आर.पी.एस. गार्चा की अध्यक्षता वाली समिति की शक्ति को 28-2-1993 तक बढ़ाया जाता है जिससे मांति शक्ति जांच पूरी करके अपनी रिपोर्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार को प्रस्तुत कर सके।

[संख्या ए.वी.-15013/8/92-एस.एस.वी
पी.के. बैनर्जी, संयुक्त सचिव

MINISTRY OF CIVIL AVIATION AND TOURISM

(Deptt. of Civil Aviation)

New Delhi, the 12th January, 1993

S.O. 283.—In partial modification of this Ministry's notification of even number dated 16-10-1992, the period of the Committee of Inquiry headed by Air Cmde. R. P. S. Garcha inquiring into the crash of BSF Beechcraft Super King aircraft VT-EOA, while carrying out local flying in Delhi on 27-8-1992, is extended upto 28-02-1993 to enable the Committee to complete its inquiry and submit its report to the Central Government.

[No. AV. 15013/8/92-SSV]

P. K. BANERJI, Jt. Secy.

अन्य मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 14 जनवरी, 1993

का.आ. 234:—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुक्रम में, केन्द्रीय सरकार सैदपुर 9-10 पिट्स कोलियरी आर्क पैरा ई सी लि. के प्रबन्धन के संबंध में निम्नलिखित और उनके कार्यकारी के बीच, अनुबंध में निम्नलिखित औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, आन्सोल के विवाद की प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 13-1-93 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[संख्या एन-22012/427/91-आई प्रार (सी II)]

राजलाल, डेस्क अधिकारी

MINISTRY OF LABOUR

New Delhi, the 14th January, 1993

S.O. 284.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Asansol as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Sodepur 9/10 Pits Colliery of E.C. Ltd. and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 13-1-93.

[No. L-22012/427/91-IR.C-II]

RAJA LAL, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, ASANSOL

Reference No. 20/92

PRESENT:

Shri N. K. Saha, Presiding Officer

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the Management of Sodepur 9 and 10 Pits Colliery of E.C. Ltd.

AND

Their Workman.

APPEARANCES:

For the Employers—Sri B. N. Lala, Advocate.

For the Workman—Sri Samiran Chakravorty, Representative of workman.

INDUSTRY : Coal.

STATE : West Bengal.

Dated, the 29th December, 1992

AWARD

The Government of India in the Ministry of Labour in exercise of the powers conferred on them by clause (d) of

sub-section (1) and sub-section (2A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide Ministry's Order No. L-22012/427/91-IR(C.II) dated 12-5-92.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the Agent, Sodepur (R) Colliery, ECL, P.O. Sunderchak, Dist. Burdwan in not paying the wages for the period from 16-5-87 to 30-11-87 to Shri Abdul Samad, Driller is justified? If not to what relief is the concerned workman entitled to?"

2. During the pendency of the case today (29-12-92) the representatives of both the parties submit that this case will be settled out of Court which will take time and it will be convenient for both the parties to settle up the matter out of Court without keeping this case pending.

3. They submit that a no-dispute award may be passed for the present. So for ends of justice a no-dispute award is passed in this case for the present.

N. K. SAHA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 जनवरी, 1993

का.आ. 285 :—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार परबेली कोलियरी आफ मैसर्स ई सी लि. के प्रबन्ध-तंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निहित औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, आसनसोल के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 13-1-93 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[संख्या एल-22012/281/91-आई आर (सी-II)]

राजालाल, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th January, 1993

S.O. 285.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Asansol as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Parbelia Colliery of M/s. B.C. Ltd. and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 13-1-93.

[No. L-22012/281/91-IR(C-II)]

RAJA LAL, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, ASANSOL

Reference No. 15/92

PRESENT:

Shri N. K. Saha, Presiding Officer.

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to, the Management of Parbelia Colliery of M/s. E. C. Ltd.

AND

Their workmen

APPEARANCES:

For the Employers—Shri B. N. Lala, Advocate.

For the Workmen—Shri Samiran Chakravorty, Representative of the Union.

INDUSTRY: Coal.

STATE: West Bengal.

Dated, the 24th December, 1992

AWARD

The Government of India in the Ministry of Labour in exercise of the powers conferred on them by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section (2A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide Ministry's Order No. L-22012/281/91-IR(C.II) dated 26-3-1992.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Parbelia Colliery of M/s. E. C. Ltd., P.O. Nuturia, Distt. Purulia, in not giving pay protection and proper fitment to S/Sri Jawahar Chouhan and Basdeo Singh on promotion to Mining Sirdar, is justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workmen are entitled to?"

2. During the pendency of the case today (24-12-92) the representatives of both the parties submit that there is every chance of amicable settlement of the dispute out of Court.

So the parties are not keen for hearing of the case. They submit that they have no objection if a no dispute award is passed at this stage. In such situation there is no other alternative but to pass a no dispute award. Accordingly a no dispute award is passed in this case.

N. K. SAHA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 जनवरी, 1993

का.आ. 286 :—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार माधोपुर कोलियरी आफ मैसर्स ई सी लि. के प्रबन्धतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच अनुबंध में निहित औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, आसनसोल के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 13-1-93 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[संख्या एल-22012/210/89-आई आर (सी-II)]

राजालाल, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th January, 1993

S.O. 286.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Asansol as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Madhaipur Colliery of M/s. E. C. Ltd. and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 13-1-1993.

[No. L-22012/210/89-IR(C.II)]

RAJA LAL, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL

TRIBUNAL, ASANSOL

Reference No. 2/90

PRESENT:

Shri N. K. Saha, Presiding Officer.

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the Management of Madhaipur Colliery of M/s. E. C. Ltd.

AND

Their Workmen.

APPEARANCES:

For the Employers—Sri P. Banerjee, Advocate.

For the Workmen—Sri Bijoy Kumar, Joint Secretary of the Union.

INDUSTRY : Coal.

STATE : West Bengal.

Dated, the 29th December, 1992

AWARD

The Government of India in the Ministry of Labour in exercise of the powers conferred on them by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section (2A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide Ministry's Order No. L-22012(210)/89-IR(C.41) dated 20-12-89/5-1-90.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the Management of Madhaipur Colliery of M/s. E. C. Ltd., in denying upgradation of S/Sri Lakhi Manta Mukherjee, Nimai Ch. Karmakar, Ganesh Pd. Shaw, Badal Ch. Ghosh and Tapan Kr. Das as Cap Lamp Issue Clerks and payment of Grade II wages from 15-3-82, is justified? If not, to what relief are the workmen concerned entitled?"

2. The case of the union in brief is that S/Sri Lakhi Manta Mukherjee, Nimai Ch. Karmakar, Ganesh Pd. Shaw, Badal Ch. Ghosh and Tapan Kr. Das were Cap Lamp Fitters of Madhaipur Colliery under Eastern Coalfields Ltd. They performed duty to the full satisfaction of the management. Being satisfied with the performance of their work the management promoted/upgraded the abovenamed workers from the post of Cap Lamp Fitter (Gr. II) w.e.f. 15-3-83. After such promotion/upgradation they began to work as Cap Lamp Issue Clerks. But the management never paid them the wages of the higher grade in spite of request by the workmen though they had been rendering services in the post of higher grade. So the workman raised a dispute through union. But the attempts of conciliation failed. The matter was referred to the Ministry of Labour, Government of India and ultimately the Ministry of Labour has sent this dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication.

3. The management has filed written objection contending inter alia that the representing union has no locus-standi to proceed with the case. The concerned workmen are not the members of the union. It is true that all the five concerned workmen were Cap Lamp Fitters of Madhaipur Colliery. The designation of the workmen was Cap Lamp Fitter. The management issued letter of authorisation in favour of the said workmen to work as Cap Lamp Issue Clerk on 15-3-82 and such authorisation was given for deploying them as Cap Lamp Issue Clerk on purely temporary basis (para 12 of the written statement). The workmen were never given any promotion and they were never upgraded to the higher grade as stated by the union. So the workmen are not entitled to get any relief in the instant case.

4. There was a settlement out of Court between S/Sri Lakhi Manta Mukherjee, Ganesh Pd. Shaw and Badal Ch. Ghosh in one side and the management on the other side and they filed a joint memorandum of settlement in this Court on 6-5-91. On the basis of the terms of the settlement an award was passed in favour of those three workmen on 6-5-91. During the pendency of this case Nimai Ch. Karmakar died and his wife filed a petition to proceed with the case on behalf of her deceased husband. But ultimately no step was taken on behalf of this deceased workman and Tapan Kr. Das. So a no dispute award was passed on 6-5-91 with respect to those two workmen.

Subsequently the case of the deceased workman Nimai Ch. Karmakar, represented by his wife Narayani Karmakar and Tapan Kr. Das was restored to file by an order dated 21-4-92. So we are now to decide the dispute with respect to the claim of Nimai Ch. Karmakar (since deceased) and Tapan Kr. Das.

5. In this case no oral or documentary evidence has been adduced by either of the parties. Nimai Ch. Karmakar died during the pendency of this case. Tapan Kr. Das has been promoted to the post of Mining Sirdar. Sri Bijoy Kumar the learned Advocate for the workmen with his usual fairness submits that the union does not press the claim of

upgradation any more as one of the workman is dead and the other workman has been promoted to a post of higher grade. He submits that the union now only claims the difference of pay for the period for which those two workmen worked as Lamp Issue Clerk in Gr. II.

6. At the very outset Sri P. Banerjee the learned Advocate for the management has urged before me that the union has no locus-standi to represent the workmen as the workmen are not members of the said union. He has urged before me that the management has taken a specific plea on that point in para 4 of the written statement. Further he has urged before me that the union has not produced any resolution showing the competency of the union and there is no document to show that the workmen were members of the representing union.

It is true that the union has not produced any oral or documentary evidence on this point. Sri Bijoy Kumar the learned Advocate for the union has urged before me that no procedure has been laid down in the Industrial Disputes Act regarding the raising of the dispute by any particular union. Moreover, he has urged before me that considering the principles of equity, natural justice and good conscience the Tribunal must hold that the union has the locus-standi to represent the workmen. Considering all the facts and circumstances of the present case and the principles of natural justice, equity and good conscience I find that the union has the locus-standi to represent the workmen.

7. Now comes the question whether the workmen are entitled to get any difference of pay as claimed by them. In para 12 of the written statement the management has clearly stated that letter of authorisation was issued in favour of the workmen on 15-3-82 to work as Cap Lamp Issue Clerk and they were deployed to work in that capacity on purely temporary basis, so they are not entitled to get any difference of pay. Sri Banerjee the learned Advocate for the management has further urged before me that there is nothing on record to show from which date to which date they actually worked as Cap Lamp Issue Clerk. As such they are not entitled to get any relief. It is admitted that the workmen had worked as Cap Lamp Issue Clerks for a certain period in Gr. II when they were holding the post of Cap Lamp Fitter's in Gr. III. Thus I find that as the authority deployed them to work in a post of higher category, the management is bound to pay the difference of wages.

8. In the result I find that the management was justified in denying upgradation of Nimai Ch. Karmakar (since deceased) and Tapan Kr. Das. But the management was not justified in denying the payment of Gr. II wages from the date Nimai Ch. Karmakar (since deceased) and Tapan Kr. Das worked as Cap Lamp Issue Clerk. Consequently I find that Nimai Ch. Karmakar (since deceased) and Tapan Kr. Das are entitled to get the difference of wages of the post of Cap Lamp Fitters (Gr. III) and the post of Cap Lamp Issue Clerk (Gr. II) for the period they had actually worked in the post of Cap Lamp Issue Clerk in Gr. II.

The management is directed to pay such difference of wages within three months from the date of publication of the award, failing which the amount will carry 15 per cent interest from the date of publication of the award till the date of payment.

This is my award.

N. K. SAHA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 जनवरी, 1993

का.आ.287:—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार राजौर कोलियरी आफ इन्ड्यू सी एल. के प्रबन्धन के संबंध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निदिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, बम्बई के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 13-1-93 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[संख्या एल-22012/454/91—आई आर (सी-II)]

राजालाल, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th January, 1993

S.O. 287.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Bombay as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Rajur Colliery of W.C. Ltd. and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 13-1-93.

[No. L-22012/454/91-IR(C-II)]

RAJA LAL, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 2, BOMBAY

PRESENT :

Shri P. D. Apsankar

Presiding Officer.

Reference No. CGIT-2/18 of 1992

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the Management of Rajur Colliery of W. C. Ltd.

AND

Their Workmen

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers.—Mr. G. S. Kapur, Advocate.

For the Workman.—No Appearance.

INDUSTRY : Coal Mines. STATE : Maharashtra.
Bombay, dated 3rd December, 1992

AWARD

The Central Government by their order No. L-22012/454/91-IR(C-II) dated 24-3-1992 have referred the following Industrial Dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

"Whether the termination of Shri Gautam Baprao Nagrale, General Mazdoor, from 24-9-1988 by the Manager, Rajur Colliery W. C. Ltd., Dist. Yavatmal, is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?"

2. The present reference was received by this Tribunal from the Central Government on 30-3-1992. Thereafter the necessary notices of this reference were issued to both the parties, directing them to appear before this Tribunal, and of file their Statement of Claim and the Written Statement. Accordingly the advocate for the management appeared before this Tribunal on 20-5-92 and on the subsequent days. However the workman remained absent since the beginning, i.e. 28-4-1992. The necessary notice was sent to the workman at his address of the Rajur Colliery, Clo. R.K.K.M.S., W. C. Ltd., Wani Area, Dist. Yavatmal (MS) which was received by some representative on 26-5-1992. However, neither the workman nor anybody from his union appeared thereafter. Thereafter a fresh notice was sent to the said union, by Registered post A.D. and it is seen that some representative of the union received it on 9-7-1992. However even thereafter nobody from the union appeared before this Tribunal. Again a third notice was sent to the workman at his address of the Rajur Colliery, and it was received by somebody on his behalf on 16-11-1992. However neither the workman nor anybody from the union appeared before this Tribunal till today.

3. The workman had challenged the action of the management in question for terminating the service. However he did not file any Statement of Claim, and also did not produce

any evidence in support of his case at any time. As such the present reference stands disposed of.

P. D. APSHANKAR, Presiding Officer.

नई दिल्ली, 18 जनवरी, 1993

का.अ. 288 :—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) का धारा 17 के अन्तर्गत में, केन्द्रीय सरकार फूड कॉर्पोरेशन ऑफ इंडिया के प्रबन्ध-तंत्र के संबंध विमोचनों और उनके कार्यकारी के बीच, अनुबंध में निहित औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, धनबाद के संबंध का प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 18-1-93 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-22012/155/एफ/91-आईआर (सी-II)]

राजा लाल, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th January, 1993

S.O. 288.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Food Corporation of India and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 18-1-93.

[No. L-22012/155/F/91/I.R.(C-II)]

RAJA LAL, Desk Officer.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 1, DHANBAD

In the matter of a reference under section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947,

Reference No. 91 of 1991.

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management Food Corporation of India.

AND

Their Workmen.

PRESENT :

Shri S. K. Mitra,

Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers.—Shri B. Joshi, Advocate.

For the Workmen.—Shri V. Kumar, State Jt. Secretary, F.C.I., Patna.

STATE : Bihar.

INDUSTRY : Food.

Dated, the 7th January, 1993

AWARD

By Order No. L-22012/155/F/91-I.R. (Coal-II), dated, the 27th September, 1991, the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour, has, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal :—

"Whether the action of the management without complying Section 25-F of the I.D. Act 1947 and not taking him back with full back wages from 20-1-88

along with regularisation of service and payment of back wages equal to regular class IV workman are in order and justified? If not to what relief the workman concerned is entitled?

2. The case of the Food Corporation of India, Patna, as disclosed in the written statement, details apart, is as follows :—

The present reference is not legally maintainable. The Food Corporation of India is a statutory body created under the provisions of Food Corporation Act, 1964. The District Manager posted in different district of F.C.I. work under the control of the Sr. Regional Manager/Regional Manager who themselves work under the control of Zonal Manager. The District Managers are empowered to engage casual worker for a period for 7 days only as and when necessary in emergency cases. They are required to inform the Zonal Manager regarding such temporary casual employment. Any appointment in violation of the provisions of FCI Staff Regulation in a regular post is illegal and void-ab-initio. Any appointment made in violation of the provision of guideline of FCI Headquarters by a person not competent to appoint and if so appointed such appointee is allowed to continue beyond the period specified, the appointment and subsequent continuance becomes irregular. The management issued circular No. 28 of 1986 dated 2-5-86 drawing attention of different officers of the management with regard to casual appointment. The attentions of the officers were drawn to the earlier circular No. 33 of 1980 dated 26-3-80 which envisages appointment of casual worker only upto a period of 7 days only. It was made clear that disciplinary action would be taken against the officer who would infringe the direction. The concerned workman, Pawan Kumar Ram, was engaged as casual worker on 19-4-86 by the then Asstt. Manager, Food Storage Depot, Jasidih falling within the jurisdiction of District Manager, District Office, Bhagalpur. He was unauthorisedly engaged by the Asstt. Manager (D) without obtaining approval from the District Manager as casual worker at the initial stage. He was not authorised to engage casual worker for more than 7 days in the case of emergency. No emergency existed necessitating engagement of casual worker at the relevant time. The Asstt. Manager allowed him to work for more than a year without any authority. Thus, the engagement of the concerned workman was illegal, irregular, void and contrary to the provisions of the Staff Regulations. The Asstt. Manager (D), Food Storage Depot, Jasidih was asked explanation for engaging Pawan Kumar Ram as casual labour/workman. The District Manager directed realisation of payments made to Pawan Kumar Ram from the salary of the Asstt. Manager who was the Depot Incharge of Food Storage Depot, Jasidih in respect of the wage paid to Sri Ram for the month of November and December, 1987. The Asstt. Manager discontinued engagement of the concerned workman with effect from 20-1-88 when he was warned and money was realised from his salary for illegal and unauthorised engagement of Pawan Kumar Ram. The management does not take responsibility of a workman who secures employment with collusion of some interested person who is not authorised to appoint or allow continuance of job beyond 7 days under emergency conditions. As the appointment of the concerned workman was illegal and void he cannot get any relief from the management.

3. The case of the concerned workman, as disclosed in the written statement submitted by him, briefly stated, is as follows :

The concerned workman was employed by the management on 19-4-86 at Food Storage Depot, Jasidih, as casual workman to perform duties of a subordinate cadre like Category-IV employee of the Corporation and worked there without any break to the satisfaction of his superior till 20-1-88. He has worked more than 240 days continuously within 12 calendar months as required under Section 25-F of the I.D. Act. He has worked for 247 days in 1986, 354 days in 1987 and in January, 1988 he had worked 20 days till 20-1-1988. He has retrenched from service with effect from 21-1-1988 without any notice or notice pay and compensation and no intimation was given to the appropriate Government which is contravention of Sec 25F of the I.D. Act. The services of more than 70 workmen who were em-

ployed like the concerned workman had already been regularised in Class-IV post in F.C.I. and they have been posted as Watchmen. Hence, the concerned workman is also entitled for his regularisation to the post of Watchmen. Although he was performing similar/identical nature of duties which regular casual employees perform, he was getting less wages and no other benefits were extended to him. During the conciliation proceeding the management fairly admitted the case of the concerned workman that he was appointed on 19-4-1986 and worked there till 20-1-1988 and has completed more than 240 days' service within 12 calendar months. The management further admitted that he was retrenched from service on 20-1-1988 without any notice or notice pay and compensation and the provision of Sec. 25-F of the I.D. Act, 1947 were not complied with. In the circumstances, the concerned workman has claimed that he be reinstated in service from the date of his retrenchment with full back wages at par with regular Class-IV workman and for regularisation of his service as Watchman.

4. In rejoinder to the written statement of the concerned workman, the management has denied and disputed the attendance put in by the concerned workman and taken the stance that he is not entitled to retrenchment compensation or notice pay under Sec. 25-F of the I.D. Act as his appointment was illegal.

5. In rejoinder to the written statement of the management, the concerned workman has stated that he was employed by the Asstt. Manager (D) of Food Storage Depot, Jasidih, with the approval of District Manager, Bhagalpur who is the competent authority. His engagement was known to the District Manager as his payment of wages was made by the District Manager, F.C.I., Bhagalpur. Hence, he was employed with the consent of the competent authority and as such, such appointment is legal and he is entitled to claim all the relief as mentioned in his written statement.

6. The management, in order to justify its action, has examined M.W.I A. K. Roy, at present holding the post of Zonal Manager at Zonal Office East at Calcutta and introduced in evidence a number of documents which have been marked Ext. M-1 to M-6.

On the other hand, the concerned workman has examined himself in support of his case and laid in evidence some documents which have been marked Ext. W-1 to W-5.

7. It is the irrefragable position that Pawan Kumar Ram was engaged by the Asstt. Manager of Food Storage Depot, Jasidih on 19-4-86 as casual workman and that the concerned workman had worked in the depot for 247 days in 1986, 354 days in 1987 and 20 days in January, 1988 and his service was terminated with effect from 21-1-88. This position also is borne out from the letter of the Sr. Regional Manager dated 11-1-91 to the Asstt. Labour Commissioner (C), Patna (Ext. W-1) and the statement of attendance of the concerned workman submitted by the District Manager (Ext. W-1). The letter of the Asstt. Manager (D), F.C.I., Jasidih dated 21-1-88 to the District Manager, Bhagalpur indicates that the engagement of the concerned workman was discontinued with effect from 21-1-88 (Ext. W-3).

8. Thus, from the evidence on record it is evident that the concerned workman was employed in continuous service for more than one year under his employer. But his employer has not admittedly complied with the condition precedent to retrenchment as envisaged under Sec. 25-F of the I.D. Act. This section envisages (a) that the concerned workman should be given one month's notice indicating the reason for retrenchment and the period of notice expires or the workman has been paid in lieu of such notice wages for the period of notice; (b) that the workman has been paid, at the time of retrenchment, compensation which shall be the equivalent to 15 days' average for every completed year of continuous service or any part thereof in excess of six months; and (c) notice in the prescribed manner is sent on the appropriate Government or such authority as may be specified by the appropriate Government.

Admittedly, the management has not complied with any of these provisions.

9. But the management has sought to justify its action by taking the stance that the initial appointment and his continuance in service by the Asstt. Manager (D), Food

Storage Depot, Josidih, as casual workman was illegal and so it shall be deemed that he was never engaged at all. In support of this contention the case of Bijoy Kumar Bharti & others Vs. State of Bihar and others reported in 1983 Lab. I.C. 1884 (Patna) has been cited. I am constrained to state that no such proposition of law as mentioned by the management is enshrined in this decision. The Court has held that any workman appointed illegally or irregularly has no right to claim or continue in the post. Their Lordships have not decided that the provisions of Sec. 25-F of the I.D. Act are not applicable to such workman. Admittedly, the concerned workman was engaged by the F.C.I. and he worked for more than 240 days in 1986 and 1987. That being so, the management is bound to comply with the provision of Sec. 25-F of the I.D. Act before terminating his service by way of retrenchment. Hence, I consider that the action of the management in terminating the service of the concerned workman without complying with the provisions of Sec. 25-F of the I.D. Act is illegal and unjustified.

10. The management has taken the stance in its written statement that the concerned workman secured the employment with the collusion of some interested person who is not authorised to appoint or allow continuance of job beyond 7 days under emergency condition. It appears from the evidence that Rajendra Sinha was the Depot Incharge of Josidih at the time when the concerned workman was engaged (Exts. W-4 M-6). There is not a whit of evidence on record to indicate that the concerned workman secured employment in collusion with Sri Sinha. MW-1 A. K. Roy has stated that on enquiry he found that the concerned workman used to come once in a while at the Depot and used to serve some glasses of water, and that he got information and indication that he was working in the house of the Asstt. Manager. The concerned workman has denied these allegations. Sri Roy has not provided the source of information or indication that the concerned workman was working in the house of the Asstt. Manager. In the comments provided to the Asstt. Labour Commissioner (C) the management has not taken this stance (Ext. W-1). The documents produced by the management do not also support the stance of the management. That being so, I consider that the statement of Sri Roy with regard to the work done by the concerned workman at the Depot and his working in the house of the Asstt. Manager is embellishment of fact in order to lend succour to the case of the management.

11. The evidence of the concerned workman discloses that he used to get his wages from the District office, Bhagalpur. His rejoinder to the management's written statement discloses that his appointment was known to the District Manager, Bhagalpur as the wages were being paid by the District Manager, Bhagalpur. This statement of fact has remained unassailed. The District Manager, Bhagalpur, it appears, disapproval of the engagement of the concerned workman as casual workman sometime in the last part of October, 1987 (Ext. W-4 M-6).

12. The concerned workman has claimed regularisation in service as Class IV employee. In his statement, he has stated that his duty roster was at par with regular workman. He has further stated that during 1988-89 many of the casual workmen were regularised in service. His written statement discloses that they were regularised in service as Watchmen. But there is no evidence on record to indicate that any post of Watchman has remained vacant either at Josidih or elsewhere. Hence, his claim for regularisation as Watchman is not sustainable. But the management should try to regularise him in service if and when any vacancy in Class IV post arises.

13. Accordingly, the following award is rendered: the action of the management in terminating the service of the concerned workman with effect from 21-1-88 is not justified. The management is directed to re-instate him in service as casual workman with effect from the date of his termination of service and to pay him full back wages within one month from the date of publication of the award. The management should consider his claim for regularisation in service as Class IV employee as and when vacancy in such post arises. The concerned workman (Payam Kumar Ram) is directed to report for duty within the period prescribed.

In the circumstances of the case, I award no cost.

S. K. MITRA, Presiding Officer

नं. दि. नि. 14 जनवरी 1993

का.प्र. 289 :—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्र सरकार बीजापुर ग्रामिण बैंक के प्रबन्धांत्र के संबद्ध नियोज्जित और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निविष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, बंगलूर के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार की 14-1-93 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[संख्या एन-12012/32/88-डी० IV (ए)/डी-III-(ए)]

सुवश कुमार जैन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th January, 1993

S.O. 289.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Bangalore as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Bijapur Grameena Bank and their workmen was received by the Central Government on 14-1-1993.

[No. L-12012/32/88-D.IV (A)/D.III (A)]

S. K. JAIN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, BANGALORE

Dated this 31st day of December, 1992

PRESENT :

Shri M. B. Vishwanath, B.Sc., B.I., Presiding Officer.

Central Reference No. 58/88

I PARTY :

Miss. Sharada Kumari Shetty, C/o Shri M. H. Bhat, Advocate, No. 59, Gokul Road, Hosur, Hubli-580021.

Vs.

II PARTY :

Their Chairman, Bijapur Grameena Bank, H.P. Nahar Buildings, Kabraji Bazaar, Bijapur-586101.

AWARD

In this reference made by the Hon'ble Central Government by its Order No. L-12012/32/88-D.IV (A)/D.III (A) dated 25th October, 1988 under Section 10(1)(d) of I. D. Act, the point for adjudication as per schedule to reference is :

"Whether the action of the management of Bijapur Grameena Bank, Bijapur in terminating Miss. Sharda Kumari Shetty, Junior Asstt. w.e.f. 31-12-83 is justified? If not, to what relief, the concerned workman is entitled to?"

2. In the claim statement it is contended :—

On the advertisement given by the II party bank for various posts, the I party applied for Jr. Asst./Clerk's post alongwith required documents, since she was qualified for the said post. The I party was called for tests and interview. She succeeded in writing and oral tests. After the due interview and verification of the original documents produced by the I party, she was appointed as Jr. Asst./Clerk in the II party bank. In pursuance of the same she joined her service on 7-4-83. Prior to this date she has worked on daily wages of Rs. 10 per day w.e.f. 31-3-1983 in the II party bank. Subsequently her appointment as Jr. Asst./Clerk was ratified in the Board of management of the II party Bank held on 28-6-1983. An agreement to serve at least for five years in the II party bank was got executed by the I party.

The I party was deputed for training for 15 days to Belgium. After successful completion of the training she again joined in the head office of the II party bank at Bijapur. Her progress in the work was watched by the management every week and the same has been appreciated throughout. The service records of the I party are quite clean and unblemished throughout.

Surprisingly and to the shock of the I party she received a memorandum dated 31-12-1983 from the II party bank stating therein that she was relieved of her service on the close of the office hours on 31-12-1983.

The termination of the services of the I party is illegal. The reason given by the II party was that the I party had submitted a false residence certificate with her application for appointment and thereby committed a misconduct. This allegation is false. The I party has not submitted any false residence certificate. She had not committed any misconduct. The II party has not conducted any enquiry against the I party. Since the removal of the I party is ab initio void, she is entitled to be reinstated with full back wages. Since the I party had worked for more than 90 days under the II party, as per the provisions of C. and R. rules she had become a permanent employee. Further, the I party was in the employment of the II party continuously for more than 240 days. The removal of I party amounts to retrenchment and the provisions of retrenchment under I. D. Act have not been complied. No notice of Retrenchment was given. Retrenchment compensation has not been paid. The I party is entitled to reinstatement with continuity of service and back wages.

3. In the counter statement it is contended :—

The reference is bad. There is delay in raising the dispute. The II party is a Gramscna Bank sponsored by Syndicate Bank. The bank issued an advertisement as per the guidelines which is binding on the bank. The advertisement issued by the bank called for applications from the candidates belonging to the area of operation of the Bank. The bank also required the candidates to produce a resident certificate in proof of domicile. The I party applied to the post of Jr. Asst. and also submitted a resident certificate issued by the Tahasildar, Bijapur. Later, on verification it was found that the I party is not a resident of the District. It is also submitted that the I party was not appointed for any post whatsoever. The I party was asked to undergo training which is a pre-requisite for an employment. Since she was not a resident of Bijapur District she was relieved from the training as could be seen from the letter, dated 31-12-83. The bank was fully justified in discontinuing the services of the I party since she did not fulfil the domicile condition. The I party was gainfully employed in South Kanara District. She has been working in Bombay now. The I party is not entitled to reinstatement. It is not true that the I party attained the status of permanent employee. It is not true that the removal of I party amounts to retrenchment. The I party was told of the reason for the termination of her services. It is not true that the I party has completed 240 days of continuous service. The I party is not entitled to any relief.

4. The I party has filed re-joinder. In the re-joinder she has stated that the reference is good. The delay was because of a wrong forum at the instance of the State Government. It is not true that on verification it was found that the I party was not a resident of Bijapur District. The I party is a resident of Bijapur District and so a valid resident certificate had been issued by the concerned Tahasildar. It is not true that the I party was and is gainfully employed. The termination of the services of the I party is illegal.

5. As could be seen from the order sheet dated 10-12-88 the following issue has been framed by my Learned Predecessor :—

1. Whether the reference is bad in law for the reasons stated in para 1 of the counter statement ?

6. On 10-2-89 my Learned Predecessor has framed the following 5 additional issues :—

271 GU/93-88

1. Is the reference liable to be rejected for the reasons shown in para 1 of the counter statement ?

2. Whether the II party proves that she was not a resident of Bijapur District, that she had given a false domicile certificate and that the II party was justified in discontinuing her as contended in para 2 of the counter statement ?

3. Whether the alleged termination of her services is contrary to Section 25-F of the I. D. Act ?

4. Whether the II party was justified in discontinuing her for the alleged act of misconduct ?

5. What order ?

7. As could be seen from the order passed on 16-5-89 on I.A. IV, my Learned Predecessor has framed further the following issues :—

5. Whether II party can now justified before this Court the misconduct alleged against the I party when it has not initiated any disciplinary action against her, by issuing a charge sheet ?

6. Whether the I party employee proves that she has been removed from service for misconduct, as contended by her ?

8. On behalf of the II party MW-1 Man Mohan (Officer) and MW-2 Vaman Shenoy (Vigilance Officer) have been examined. On behalf of the I party she has got herself examined and closed her case.

9. It is not the case of the I party that she committed misconduct and so her removal was justified. My Learned Predecessor has committed a bona fide mistake by framing issue No. 6 shown in para 7 of this award. I delete issue No. 6.

10. In para 1 of the counter statement it is stated that the complaint of the I party regarding termination of her services was referred by the State Government to the Labour Court, Hubli. Later this has been withdrawn since the said Labour Court had no jurisdiction. Then the matter was referred to the Central Government Labour Tribunal. For this mistake the I party workman cannot be blamed. The Central Government has made the reference. No reasons were given for this Tribunal to go blind the reference. It cannot be said that the reference is bad and is liable to be rejected. Accordingly I hold issue No. 1 framed by my learned predecessor on 10-12-88 (see para 6 above) against the II party.

11. First I will take up issue No. 5 framed by my Learned Predecessor on 16-5-89 (see para 7 above). Ex. M-4 dated 7-9-83 shows that the I party workman was selected as a Junior Asstt. in the II party bank and she was directed to report for duty if she was willing to undergo the training as per the terms and conditions stated in Ex. M-4. Ex. M-7 shows that the I party has reported for duty on 3-10-83. This means, admittedly, the I party workman reported for duty in pursuance of her selection as per Ex. M-4. Ex. M-16 is the memorandum showing that the I party was relieved of her duties at the close of office hours on 31-12-83. Ex. M-16 should be construed as the order terminating the services of the I party. The I party joined the services in pursuance of her selection on 3-10-83 and her services were terminated as per Ex. M-16 on the closing hours of 31-12-83.

12. The I party was selected and she reported for duty on 3-10-83 and her services were terminated on 31-12-83. The Learned Counsel for the I party workman has produced the Bijapur Gramscna Bank Staff Service Regulations 1983, the regulations of which govern the II party. These regulations have come into force on 1-9-83. As per Regulation 30.1 an employee who knowingly does anything detrimental to the interest of the Bank or in conflicts with its instructions or who commits a breach of discipline or is guilty of any other act of misconduct is liable to be removed from service as per Regulation 30.1 (c) or dismissed from service as per regulation 30.1(f).

13. Regulation 30.2 says that no employee shall be subjected to the penalty of removal from service or dismissal from service except by an order in writing signed by the Chairman and no such orders shall be passed without the charge being formulated in writing and given to the said employee so that

she shall have reasonable opportunity to answer in writing. Regulation 30.3 says how the enquiry should be conducted. Regulation 30.2 read conjointly with regulation 30.3 clearly shows that before an employee is removed or dismissed from service a regular enquiry, after framing charges, should be held. Admittedly in the present case no enquiry has been held against the I party workman. So removal of I party cannot be sustained.

14. Ex. M-14 dated 21-12-83 produced by the II party is the show cause notice issued to the I party calling upon her to explain why her appointment should not be cancelled because she had given a false residence certificate at the time of applying for the job. This is not admitted by the I party. In the first place nothing is stated about Ex. M-14 in the counter statement. No acknowledgement has been produced to show that Ex. M-14 was served on the I party. I am of opinion that Ex. M-14 is got up.

15. For the reasons stated in the above paras 11 to 14 I hold that the order passed by the II party as per Ex. M-16 is void. Accordingly it is set aside. I hold issue No. 4 framed on 10-2-89 and issue No. 5 framed on 16-5-89 against the II party.

16. Now I will take up issue No. 2 framed on 10-2-89. Ex. M-1 dated 14-3-83 is the advertisement issued by the II party calling for the posts of Jr. Assistants. The condition for applying for this post is that the applicants shall belong to Bijapur District only, based on their schooling or by virtue of domicile. Ex. M-2 is the application of the I party filed in pursuance of Ex. M-1. Ex. M-3 is the original residence certificate given by the Tahasildar, Bijapur. As per Ex. M-3, which is issued by the competent authority Tahasildar, I party is a resident of Bijapur town. The case of the I party is that the I party does not belong to Bijapur district and she is from Karkala in Mangalore district. Ex. M-3 is a public document issued by the Tahasildar. Ex. M-17 is an endorsement issued by the then Tahasildar backing out of Ex. M-3. It is stated in Ex. M-17 that I party is not a resident of Bijapur District. Having issued Ex. M-3 the resident certificate, the concerned Revenue Authority perhaps at the instance of the II party tried to wriggle out of Ex. M-3. Anyway it is significant to note that in Ex. M-17 it is unambiguously stated in para 1 that I party workman has been residing in Bijapur Town since May 1982. The I party has stated in her evidence that she was residing at Bijapur with her other brother Shankar Shetty who was working in KSRTC as a driver. Ex. M-18 series (receipts) show that from 7-4-83 to 12-9-83 the I party workman was working under the II party on daily wages. The advertisement Ex. M-1 calling for Jr. Assistants is dated 14-3-83. Though the advertisement Ex. M-1 is dated 14-3-83, it is obvious that this advertisement has been published in newspaper subsequent to that date. MW-1 the Officer has stated that Ex. M-1 is the paper cutting. Unfortunately he has not stated the date of newspaper issue in which Ex. M-1 was published. It is obvious that it has been published in the newspaper subsequent to 14-3-83. The circumstances pointed out herein show that at the time of applying for the post in pursuance of Ex. M-1 the I party was a resident of Bijapur town, though she is from South Kanara. What the condition in the advertisement says is that she must belong to Bijapur District by schooling or by domicile. According to the Concise Oxford Dictionary domicile means "(law) place of permanent residence, fact of residing". Since the I party was already residing in Bijapur town she had fulfilled the condition of domicile prescribed in Ex. M-1. I am of opinion that in any view of the matter, at the time of applying for the job in pursuance of Ex. M-1, the I party was a domicile of Bijapur town. The stand of the II party that she was not a native of Bijapur District cannot be given any weight. The orders of the II party as per Ex. M-16 terminating services of the I party have to be set aside. The termination order is accordingly set aside.

17. For the reasons stated in the paras above I hold issue No. 2 against the II party.

18. Now I take up issue No. 3 framed on 10-2-83. In Ex. W-3 objections filed by the II party before the Labour Officer, the II party has admitted that the I party was working on temporary basis on daily wages from 7-4-83. As per Ex. M-16 the services of the I party were terminated on 31-12-83. The I party has worked continuously under the

II party from 7-4-83 to 31-12-83. In other words she had worked continuously for more than 240 days under the II party. No retrenchment notice was given to I party and no compensation was given to her, admittedly. The conditions of Section 25-F of the I. D. act have not been complied with before terminating her services. On this score also the order as per Ex. M-16 has to be set aside and I party is entitled to reinstatement.

19. For the aforesaid reasons, in any view of the matter, I am of opinion that the order terminating the services of the I party has to be set aside and I party has to be reinstated. The reconciliation proceedings were going on before the State Labour Officer mistakenly. Then the proceedings there were withdrawn and went on before the Central Government Labour Officer. The II party is not responsible for this. It is in evidence that for some time the I party was working at Bombay after her services were terminated. In the circumstances I am of opinion that if 25% of the back wages are allowed ends of justice will be met.

20. All other documents and evidence which are not referred by me above are not relevant. In any case they do not come in the way of my conclusion reached above.

ORDER

The order terminating the services of the I party workman as per Ex. M-16 is set aside. The II party is directed to reinstate the I party forthwith. The I party is entitled to continuity of service. She is entitled to 25 per cent of the back wages. Award passed as stated herein, accepting the reference.

Submit to Government.

(Dictated to Stenographer, typed by him, corrected, signed by me on this 31-12-92)

M. B. VISHWANATH, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 19 जनवरी, 1993

का.आ. 290:—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय स्टेट बैंक के प्रबन्धन के संबंध में निदिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, व श्रम न्यायालय, चण्डीगढ़ के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 19-1-93 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[संख्या एल-12012/110/88-डी-3 (ए)]

एस.के. जैन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 19th January, 1993

S.O. 290.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Chandigarh as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of State Bank of India and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 19-1-1993.

[No. I-12012/110/88-D.II(A)]

S. K. JAIN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE ARVIND KUMAR, PRESIDING OFFICER,
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-
CUM-LABOUR COURT, CHANDIGARH

Case No. I. D. 13/89

Amar Chand Vs. State Bank of India.

For the workman—Shri J. G. Verma.

For the management—Shri Ashok Khullar.

AWARD

Central Government vide Gazette Notification No. L 12012/110/88-D.II (A) dated 18th January 1989 issued U/S 10(1) (d) of the I. D. Act 1947 referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the action of the State Bank of India in denying the benefits of officiating in cash department to Shri Amar Chand, Clerk-cum-cashier in Sector-7 branch Chandigarh of State Bank of India is legal and justified ? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled to and from what date ?"

2. In the statement of claim it has been alleged that the petitioner joined the services of the Bank as clerk-cum-cashier at Kaza Branch in the year 1980 and ultimately transferred to Sector-7 branch Chandigarh on 31-10-1984. It is further pleaded that his services used to be utilised both in the accounts wing as well as in cash wing. It is further pleaded that it was settled that the management shall ask for the option of the employee for the purpose of officiating either in cash wing or accounts wing. It is pleaded that the branch manager Sector-7 branch did not call for such options. It is pleaded that there was dispute in regard to the officiating and accordingly the petitioner submitted his option to officiate in cash wing on 23-7-1986. However the petitioner was not allowed to officiate in the cash wing. The petitioner represented to the Deputy General Manager who decided to allow him to officiate as per his option dated 18-10-1986. But the petitioner was not allowed to officiate in the cash wing by the branch manager. It is further pleaded that the Union raised the industrial dispute on 15-9-1987 in which the management agreed in conciliation to allow him to work in cash wing provided he submits another option. The petitioner submitted fresh option on 15-9-1987. The petitioner was allowed to officiate in cash wing however for a day only on 16-9-1987 and again denied the officiating in the said wing. It is further pleaded that in denying the officiating to the petitioner as per his option in the cash wing is illegal and unjustified and mala fide. It is therefore, prayed that the management be directed to allow the petitioner to officiate in the cash wing as per his option dated 23-7-1986 and the petitioner be paid officiating allowance for whole of the period.

3. Claim of the petitioner was contested. The respdt. has taken the stand that the petitioner had been working and officiating in accounts wing since his joining in the branch. Respdt. admitted that the petitioner submitted his option on 23-7-1986 to work and not to officiate in the cash wing as per circular under reference. It is further pleaded that the petitioner has not right to opt for officiating in cash wing because he was already officiating in the accounts wing since his joining. Therefore, implicitly he is deemed to have opted for officiating in the accounts wing. It is, therefore submitted that there is no distinction of pecuniary benefits for officiating in either of the depts. It is further pleaded that the officiating powers can not be claimed as a matter of right as per Bank's norms laid down in the paragraph No. 446. Therefore, it is clear that suitability of the concerned staff has to be seen while entrusting him the officiating powers. Since the petitioner was already working and officiating in the accounts wing, therefore, he had some experience in that wing and it was thus in the interest of the bank to utilise his services in the accounts wing because he lacks experience in the cash department. Other contentions in the claim statement were denied.

4. Replication was also filed reasserting the contents made in the claim statement.

5. The petitioner in support of his case examined himself as WW-1 and tendered his affidavit Ex. W-1 in evidence. Respdt. management produced Shri S. K. Sharma who produced himself as MW-1 and tendered his affidavit Ex. M-1 in evidence. Workman also got proved circular No. 298/80 as WW-2 and closed their case.

6. I have heard both the parties and gone through the evidence and record on the file. The representative appearing on behalf of the workman has argued that the petitioner had opted to work in the cash wing in pursuance of the decision taken in the Award staff Circle joint consultative committee where in it has been decided that the option be asked from all the cashier-cum-clerks as to where they would like to officiate, in accounts or cash department and the officiate powers could be entrusted accordingly, however in spite of the option the petitioner was not allowed to work in cash wing.

There is no force in the contention raised by the representative of the workman. The petitioner Amar Chand in his own cross-examination has admitted that the officiating assignment is given against leave or temporary vacancy at the discretion of the bank on the basis of suitability and seniority. He has also admitted that he had worked in Sector-7 branch since 1984 and during the said period he had worked in the accounts wing. In these circumstances the petitioner is more suitable to work in the accounts wing than in cash wing. However as per bank's law in para No. 446 of the Reference Book on staff matters it is provided that officiating/relief powers are not be granted to the members of the staff as a matter of routine without examining the necessity thereof vis-a-vis the work situation and the seniority/suitability of the concerned member of the staff, for the job. It further contains that the relief powers can not be demanded as a matter of right. Officiating powers, therefore, should be given only when it is deemed necessary. Thus in view of the situation the petitioner can not claim officiating in the cash wing as a matter of right and he was allowed to work in the accounts wing since he had sufficient experience and the decision taken in the joint Award staff committee are for the clean administration and not for mis-utilising the provisions contained therein. Admitted position is that there is no difference of pecuniary benefits for officiating either in cash wing or in the accounts wing.

In view of the discussion made in the earlier paras there is no merit in the claim of the petitioner and the same is dismissed. Reference is returned accordingly,

Chandigarh.

ARVIND KUMAR, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 19 जनवरी, 1993

का. आ. 291.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेट बैंक आफ बीकानेर एण्ड जयपुर के प्रत्यन्तर्गत के संघर्ष नियोजनों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अनुबंध में निदिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण व श्रम न्यायालय चण्डीगढ़ पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 19-1-93 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[संख्या एन—12012/121/89-आई आर (बी-III)]

एस. के. जैन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi the 19th January, 1993

S.O. 291.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Chandigarh as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of State Bank of Bikaner and Jaipur and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 19th January, 1993.

[No. L-12012/121/89-IR(B.III)]

S. K. JAIN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI ARVIND KUMAR, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, CHANDIGARH

Case No. LD. 109/90

Inderjit Kumar

Vs.

State Bank of Bikaner and Jaipur.

For the workman—Shri T. C. Sharma.

For the management—Shri H. N. Mehtani.

AWARD

Central Government vide gazette notification No. L-12012/121/89-K. B.II dated 24th August, 1990 issued U/s. 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication:

"Whether the action of the management of State Bank of Bikaner and Jaipur in terminating the services of Shri Indrajit Kumari, peon in the Jalandhar branch of the bank w.e.f. 22nd February, 1979 is justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?"

2. In the statement of claim it has been alleged that he was employed through employment exchange on 4th September, 1978 as a peon in the subordinate staff and the management has terminated his services w.e.f. 22nd February, 1979. The bank management has retained junior persons in the employment and also employed large number of persons in the sub staff after the termination of the services of the petitioner and thus has violated the provisions of Section 25G & H of the I.D. Act, 1947. It is further alleged that the respondent management has violated the provisions of Desai Award. It is further alleged that the respondent management has issued a circular dated 23rd April, 1987 to all branches that all the ex-temporary employees were being called for affording opportunity of employment but however the petitioner was denied his request. It is prayed that the termination is illegal and prayed for the reinstatement with full back wages with continuity of service.

3. Claim of the petitioner was contested by the Respondent management by filing written statement. It was pleaded that the petitioner has not completed 240 days continuously in a year and thus not entitled to seek any relief even U/S. 25G & H of the I.D. Act, 1947. It is further pleaded that for the first time industrial dispute was raised by the petitioner after about seven years and the present industrial dispute was raised after a span of nine years. It is further pleaded that the appointment of the petitioner against which he given acceptance was only for the specified period automatically came to an end on the expiry of the period without being any need of further notice. It was denied that the post against which the petitioner was working was of temporary nature and continued to be available even after the termination of the petitioner. The management took the stand that the appointment of the petitioner was purely on ad-hoc basis to meet the exigencies and immediate need of the bank's branches for clearing the back log. It is further pleaded that the respondent management has not violated any provisions of Desai Award and Sastri Award or Bipartite Settlement and however those are not applicable in the case of the petitioner as his services automatically came to an end on the expiry of the period stipulated in the letter of appointment/extension. Other contentions of the petitioner in the statement of claim were denied. In addition plea it has been claimed that the petitioner is not entitled to any claim U/S 25G & H of the I.D. Act and prayed for the dismissal of the reference.

4. Replication was also filed reasserting the claim made in the claim statement.

5. In support of his case the petitioner examined himself as WW1 and filed his affidavit Ex. W1 in evidence. Respondent management produced Shri R. D. Duggal Manager as MW1 who filed his affidavit Ex. M1 and relied on the documents Ex. M2 the appointment letter and the extension Ex. M3. In cross-examination he admitted that the petitioner was initially appointed from 5th December, 1978 to 3rd January, 1979 and the period was again extended for 20 days. He has also admitted that in the even of exigencies after the completion of temporary tenure of the workman they have appointed sub-staff. He has shown his ignorance whether the petitioner was called at the time of appointment of sub-staff on ad-hoc basis.

6. Both the parties have filed written arguments and I have heard them orally as well. It has been stressed that the termination of the services of the petitioner is illegal and the management has violated the provisions of Section 25G & H of the I.D. Act 1947 as they have recruited large number of persons after the termination of services of the petitioner. There is no force in this contention. Provisions of Para 20.8 of the Bipartite Settlement dated 19th October, 1966 stipulates that the bank is within its competence to appoint temporary workmen against permanent vacancies for three months during which period the bank shall make arrangement for filling up the vacancies permanently. In this context the appointment of the petitioner was made. Ex. M2 is the appoint-

ment letter which clearly stipulates that the appointment of the petitioner is only for the fixed period up to 3rd January, 1979 and after the expiry of that period by efflux of time the services of the petitioner automatically stands terminated. Certainly there is no dispute to the fact that the extension was given to the petitioner and he had worked only upto 22nd February, 1979 and thus has put in only 78 days of total service. He was appointed as temporary hand and according to the terms and conditions of his appointment letter itself contained the order of termination of his services as will for which the petitioner himself gave his acceptance and joined the duty and thus the respondent management has not contravened any provisions of Bipartite Settlement/Desai Award.

7. Another plea raised by the petitioner is with regard to the violation of Section 25-H of the I.D. Act and contended that large number of persons has been employed by the Respondent bank after the termination of services of the petitioner. There is also no force in this contention. To prove this violation the petitioner is heavily burdened to adduce sufficient evidence. In his pleadings or in his evidence he has not stated that to whom the respondent management has given employment and when. There is also no evidence that the post still existed even after the termination of services of the petitioner. No doubt Mr. R. D. Duggal MW1 appearing on behalf of the management has stated that in the event of exigencies they have appointed sub staff after the completion of temporary tenure of the workman but the workman has failed to clarify when those vacancies had existed. In this circumstances it can not be said that the post against which the petitioner was working continued after the termination of the services of the petitioner. The ratio of the judgement reported in 1991(3) Services Cases today page 127 State of Punjab Vs. Ram Murti is followed. Not only this the petitioner in his own case in the statement of claim has admitted that in the year 1987 the respondent management had issued circular for affording opportunity for employment to all the ex-temporary employees and his request was denied. Thus in his own case as apparent above the management has complied with the provisions of Section 25-H of the I.D. Act 1947.

In view of the discussion made in earlier paras, the action of the management in terminating the services of the petitioner is justified and the workman is not entitled to any relief. However, I must express my concern for the poor workman since he had already worked with the respondent management and has an experience to the post. I therefore, recommend to the respondent management to give opportunity to the petitioner for the post subject to the availability as an act of benevolence or goodwill gesture on their part. The award is returned accordingly.

Chandigarh.

5th November, 1992.

ARVIND KUMAR, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 15 जनवरी, 1993

का. आ. 292.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मै. के. एम. आई कन्हैयास्थान, राजमहल साहिबगंज के प्रबन्धन के संबद्ध निशोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, धनबाद के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 12-1-93 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[संख्या एल-29012/9/88-डी-III बी
बी. एम. डेविड, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 15th January, 1993

S.O. 292.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. KMI Kanhaiyasthan Rajmahal, Sahib-

gani and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 12th January, 1993.

[No. L-29012/9/88-D.III(B)]
B. M. DAVID, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

PRESENT :

Shri B. Ram, Presiding Officer.

In the matter of an industrial dispute under Section 10(1)(d)
of the I.D. Act, 1947

Reference No. 57 of 1988

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of M/s. KMI
Kanhaiyasthan, Rajmahal (Sahibganj)

AND

Their workmen.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the workmen—None.

On behalf of the employers—None.

STATE : Bihar.

INDUSTRY : Stone.

Dhanbad, the 30th December, 1992

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-29012/9/88-D.III(B) dated, the 9th March, 1988.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of M/s. KMI Kanhaiyasthan, P.O. Rajmahal, District Sahibganj in terminating the services of Shri Satish Mundal, Sirdar w.e.f. 14th July, 1985 is justified? If not, what relief is the workman entitled to?"

2. This reference is pending for filling W.S. by the parties since the year March, 1992. Necessary notices were issued to the parties but in spite of several adjournment none appeared nor they filed W.S. It appears therefore, that none of the parties are interested in pursuing the matter and hence a 'No Dispute' Award is passed.

B. RAM, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 जनवरी, 1993

का. आ. 293.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार श्री हुकम सिंह कमल ठेकेदार सिलजोदा, कालीमती मंगनीज माईन्स, मै. मांगीलाल रून्गा (प्राई.) लिमिटेड जिला कियोन्जहार के प्रबन्धन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निविष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में औद्योगिक अधिकरण, उड़ीसा (भुवनेश्वर) के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-1-93 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[संख्या एन-27012/2/90-आईआर (मिस.)]

बी. एम. डेविड, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th January, 1993

S.O. 293.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Industrial Tribunal, Orissa (Bhubaneswar) as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Shri Hukum Singh Kamal, Contractor, S. P. Joda, Kalimati Manganes Mines of M/s. Mangal Rungta (P) Ltd., Distt. Keonjhar, and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 20-1-1993.

[No. L-27012/2/90-IR (Misc)]

B. M. DAVID, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, ORISSA, BHUBANESHWAR

PRESENT :

Shri R. K. Dash, J.L. B., Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Orissa, Bhubaneswar,

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE CASE NO. 26 OF 1990

(CENTRAL)

Bhubaneswar, the 31st December, 1992

BI TWIEN :

The Management of Shri Hukum Singh Kamal, Contractor, Siljoda, Kalimati Manganes Mines of M/s. Mangilal Rungta (P) Ltd., Keonjhar.

2. M/s. Mangilal Rungta (P) Ltd., At/P. O. Siljoda, Via-Joda, Distt., Keonjhar.

...First Party—Managements.

(AND)

Their workman Shri Benudhar Pradhan, represented through Orissa Mining Workers Union, At/P. O. Guruda, Via Joda, Distt. Keonjhar.

.. Second Party—Workman.

APPEARANCES :

Shri A. Banerjee, Asstt. Manager (Personnel & Administration) — For the first party management

Shri B. Pradhan, the workman himself. — For the second party workman.

AWARD

The Government of India in the Ministry of Labour, in exercise of its power conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section (2A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), have referred the following dispute for adjudication vide their Order No. L-27012/2/90-IR (Misc.), dated 5-7-1990 :—

"Whether the action of the management of Shri Hukum Singh Kamal, contractor, Siljoda Kalimati Manganes Mines of M/s. Mangilal Rungta (P) Ltd. At/P. O. Siljoda, Via Joda, Distt. Keonjhar in terminating the services of Shri Benudhar Pradhan, Munshi w.e.f. 3-9-1988 is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?"

2. Briefly stated the case of the workman is that he was a Munshi under Hukum Singh Kamal, a contractor of Siljoda-Kalimati Manganes Mines of M/s. Mangilal Rungta (P) Ltd. since 5-9-1978 and without any rhyme and reason his employer terminated him from services on 3-9-1988. Such action of his master being illegal he has sought for reinstatement with full back wages and other consequential benefits.

3. Both the contractor as well as the principal employer have filed separate written statements. In nutshell the case of the contractor, the immediate employer, is that though the workman was under his employment since 1978 but during tenure of his service he very often remained absent unauthorisedly and finally he was unheard of since 23-2-88 till 3-9-1988. This necessitated the employer to issue him a notice under certificate of posting at his village address. Despite of such notice when he did not respond, his name was struck off from the rolls. It is further alleged that the

workman while in service was involved with various offences. He committed rape on two minor girls and enticed a married woman. So, apprehending assault at the hands of the public for his notorious activities he left the job and was unheard of for a considerable period. In such a situation there was no other alternative than to adopt such course by deleting his name from employment.

It is needless to refer to the written statement of the principal employer in view of the term of reference to ascertain if the action of the immediate employer, namely, the contractor in terminating the workman from his services is legal and justified.

4. In course of hearing both parties, namely, the workman and the contractor led evidence in support of their respective case. The management examined two witnesses and proved certain documents. Of the two witnesses, witness No. 1 speaks that a notice was sent to the workman by registered post asking him to join his service. On the other hand, the employer on being examined as witness No. 2 has stated that he sent such a notice under certificate of posting. He has proved the copy of the notice, Ext. 1 and the postal receipt, Ext. 2. It is borne out from the said notice that the workman was intimated that unless he joined his duty within fifteen days his name would be struck off from the register. It transpires from the postal seal put on the receipt Ext. 2 that though the letter was sent to the workman but the date appearing thereon has been interpolated. Therefore, it is doubtful whether any notice was at all sent under certificate of posting as deposed to by M. W. 2. If at all the employer sincerely desired to inform the workman that if he did not join his duty his name would be struck off from the Roll, then in that case he would have sent such notice by registered post.

The employer (M.W. 2) has proved the attendance register, Ext. 3 to show the continued absence of the workman from duty. The genuineness of the said register is doubt as because it does not bear either initial or signature of the person in charge of marking the attendance of the employees. This apart, when the fact of some employees leaving their service finds mention in the remarks column of the attendance register, Ext. 3 it was however not so stated in the case of the workman if at all he left the service and remained unheard of for a pretty long time.

It is the consistent case of the employer that due to long absence of the workman his name was struck off from the Rolls but a perusal of the attendance register for the month of September would indicate otherwise. Instead of striking off his name the employer terminated his service as mentioned in the remarks column. In view of such admission, I am inclined to believe the case of the workman that his services were terminated on 3-9-1988.

5. The workman has given his own statement and proved two documents, Exes. A & B. As deposed to by him, after his services were terminated he sent a letter, Ext. A under the registered cover, Ext. B intimating his employer to take him back to employment and to pay him wages. That letter returned unserved on being refused by the addressee. It does not stand to reason as to why the employer refused to receive the registered letter, Ext. B if at all he sincerely desired that the workman should continue in his service. On the contrary from the pleadings coupled with the evidence and circumstances, as discussed above, it would reveal that the employer being annoyed with the alleged notorious activities of the workman which had no nexus with the duty wanted to remove him from service and ultimately he did so by terminating his services on 3-9-1988.

6. In view of my discussions made above, I hold that termination of service of the workman is illegal and unjustified and so, he be reinstated in service and paid all back wages. Payment be made by his employer, namely, Shri Tukum Singh Kamal within a period of three months from the date of publication of this Award.

7. The reference is answered accordingly.

Dictated & corrected by me.

R. K. DASH, Presiding Officer.

नई दिल्ली, 20 जनवरी, 1993

का. प्रा. 294.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार ने, संयुक्त सचिव (प्रा.) लिमिटेड बम्बई के प्रबन्धन के संबद्ध निोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निदिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, नं. 2 बम्बई के पंचद को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-1-93 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[संख्या एल—31012/7/90—आई आर (मिस)]

श्री. एम. डेविड, ईस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th January, 1993

S.O. 294.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 2, Bombay as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. Seascan Services Pvt. Ltd, Bombay and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 20-1-1993.

[No. L-31012/7/90-IR (Misc.)]

B. M. DAVID, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 2 BOMBAY

PRESENT :

Shri P. D. Apshankar, Presiding Officer.
Reference No. CGIT-2/16 of 1990

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of M/s. Seascan Services Pvt. Ltd., Bombay.

AND

Their Workman.

APPEARANCES :

For the employers—Shri K. M. Naik, representative.

For the workman—Shri J. H. Sawant, representative.

INDUSTRY : Ports and Docks STATE : Maharashtra

Bombay, the 1st December, 1992

AWARD

The Central Government by their Order No. L-31012/7/90-IR (Misc.) dated -7-1990 have referred the following industrial dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

“Whether the action of the management of M/s. Seascan Services Pvt. Ltd., Bombay, in transferring Shri Dilip R. Naik, Tally Clerk from Bombay Office to Tuticorin office w.e.f. 21-11-1988 and subsequently terminating his services w.e.f. 26-11-1988, is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?”

2. The case of the workman Shri D. R. Naik as disclosed from the Statement of Claim (Ex. W-2) filed on his behalf by the Secretary of the B.P.T. Employees' Union in short is thus :—

The said workman is a permanent employee of M/s. Seascan Services Pvt. Ltd., Bombay, working as a Clerk w.e.f. 17-6-1985. He took active part in organising the workman under the banner of the B.P.T. Employees' Union. The management of the said company, however, issued a letter to him dated 21-11-1988 asking him to report for duty

to Tuticorin office in the State of Tamilnadu, permanently. The workman by his letter dated 23-11-1988 informed the management that his transfer to the said place was unlawful and would put him great inconvenience. The workman by his further letter dated 27-11-1988 informed the management that the management's action in transferring him from Bombay to Tuticorin was malafide and against the provision of law. He requested the management to allow him to continue in services at Bombay only. However the management refused to give him employment in Bombay w.e.f. 26-11-1988 and this act on the part of the management was by way of victimisation and against the principles of natural justice. The Union therefore urged that the action of the management of the said company in transferring the said workman from Bombay to Tuticorin, and subsequently terminating his services w.e.f. 26-11-1988, is not just and proper, and requested this Tribunal to hold the action in question of the company as unjust and improper and further requested that this Tribunal should direct the management to reinstate the said workman in services w.e.f. 26-11-1988 with full back wages and continuity of services.

3. The management of the said company by their Written Statement (Ex. M/3) opposed the said claim of the union, and in substance contended thus :

The company is not an 'Industry' in respect of which the Central Government is the proper of appropriate Government within the meaning of section 2A(i) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The said company is a registered commercial establishment under the Bombay Shops and Establishments Act, 1948. As such the Central Government is not the appropriate government in respect of the company's establishment in Bombay, and as such, this Central Government Industrial Tribunal has no jurisdiction to entertain and decide the present reference.

4. As regards the merits of the case, the management contended thus :

The said workman Shri Naik was transferred from Bombay to Tuticorin by the company's letter dated 21-11-1988. By virtue of the letter of appointment issued to the workman, the company has a right to transfer the workman from Bombay to any other office outside the state of Maharashtra. The said workman, instead of proceeding at the place of transfer, asked the company to withdraw the letter of transfer and stated that he be continue, to work in Bombay only. The company sent the reply in the negative to the said letter. The workman was told that his failure to proceed on transfer would amount to refusing to carry out the lawful and reasonable orders of the superiors. There was nothing wrong on the part of the company in asking him to proceed on transfer. The workman was clearly informed by the management that all his arrangements for his stay at the place of Tuticorin would be done for the first week on his transfer there by the company and that the necessary travelling expenses would be borne by the company. The workman was given sufficient and adequate time to make preparations for proceeding to Tuticorin. However the workman flatly refused to proceed to Tuticorin i.e. his place of transfer, and approached the Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central) and misrepresented the facts before him. The said workman has not yet joined for his duty at Tuticorin, nor is he reporting for duty at Bombay. The company has not terminated his services. The company is still prepared to accept him in services, in case he joins his duty at Tuticorin. The Company's act of transferring the said workman from Bombay to Tuticorin is legal just and proper. The allegation of the workman that he was taking active part for organising union is not known to the company, and in any case this has nothing to do with his transfer to Tuticorin. The Company therefore lastly proved for rejection of the prayer of the workman.

5. The Issues framed at Ex. 4 are :

- (1) Whether M/s. Seacan Services Pvt. Ltd. is an industry in respect of which the Central Government is the appropriate Government ?
- (2) Whether the present Central Government Industrial Tribunal is competent to entertain and decide the present reference ?
- (3) Whether the said company has in fact terminated the services of the workman Shri D. R. Naik ?
- (4) If so, whether the action of the said company in terminating the services of the said workman is just and proper ?
- (5) Whether the action of the management of the said company in transferring the said workman from Bombay office to Tuticorin office, is just and proper ?
- (6) To what relief, if any, the said workman is entitled ?
- (7) What Award ?

6. My findings on the said Issues are :

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes.
- (3) No.
- (4) Does not survive.
- (5) No.
- (6) As per Award below.
- (7) As per Award below.

REASONS

7. Issues Nos. 1 & 2.

The workman Shri D. R. Naik filed his affidavit (Ex. W/5) in support of his case, and he was cross-examined on behalf of the company. Shri A.L. Wagle, the Manager of the said company, filed his affidavit (Ex. M/8) in support of their case, and he was cross-examined on behalf of the workman. According to the management of the said company, the Central Government is not the appropriate Government in respect of that company, but that the Government of Maharashtra is the appropriate Government, and that the Central Government Industrial Tribunal has no jurisdiction to entertain and decide the present reference. However, the present reference has been made by the Central Government. Further, the conciliation proceedings were held by the Asst. Labour Commissioner (Central). As such, it will be presumed that the Central Government is the appropriate Government in defect of the company in question, unless some material is placed on record to show that the Government of Maharashtra is the appropriate Government in respect of that company. No such material has been placed on record, except the bare statement that the said company is registered under the Bombay Shops and Establishments Act, 1948. According to the said company the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, No. 1, Bombay has held in some other reference that the Government of Maharashtra is the appropriate Government as regards the company question. However, the judgment of that court No. 1 is not binding upon this court. Therefore, for the reasons mentioned above, I find that the Central Government is appropriate Government in respect of the Company in question and as such, the present Central Government Industrial Tribunal has jurisdiction to entertain and decide the present reference.

ISSUES NOS. 1 and 2 are therefore found in the affirmative.

8. ISSUE NOS. 3 and 4

According to the workman, the said company, after issuing the order of transfer to Tuticorin, has terminated his services. However, the said company has made a categorical statement in their Written Statement, and the witness for the said company also made clear a statement in his affidavit that the said company has not in fact terminated the services of the said workman, but that the company is still prepared to accept him in services at Tuticorin in case he joins for duty there. It is true that the name of the said workman has been removed from the muster roll of the company at Bombay. However, as the order was issued by the company transferring him from Bombay to Tuticorin, the name of that workman was removed from the muster roll of Bombay

only. Even then, according to the said company, the said workman is still in their services. I, therefore, find that the said company has not in fact terminated the services of the said workman, but has only issued an order transferring him from Bombay to Tuticorin.

Issue No. 3 is therefore found in the negative.

As such, Issue No. 4 does not survive.

9. ISSUE NO. 5

Ex. M. 10 is a letter of appointment dated 7-7-1987 of the said company appointing the said workman Shri D. R. Naik in the services of the company. This letter clearly stated that the company has a right to transfer him at its other offices as and when the necessity arises. The company by their letter dated 21-11-1988 (Ex. M/12) transferred the said workman from Bombay to Tuticorin. By this letter the workman was informed that his second class train fare, from Bombay to Tuticorin will be borne by the company, and that his lodging boarding charges of the first 7 'days' will also be borne by the company and thereafter the workman would be required to make his own arrangements. Immediately 2 days after the issue of the said letter of transfer, the workman by his letter dated 23-11-1988 informed the company that he would find it difficult to get accommodation at Tuticorin that he is quite new to that place and that he may not please be transferred to Tuticorin. The company by their reply of the same date, i.e. 23-11-1988 (Ex. M/14) informed the workman that his transfer was on business exigencies, and that he should report for duty to Tuticorin within a week. Then workman again by his letter dated 23-11-1988 (Ex. M/15) requested the company not to transfer him from Bombay to Tuticorin, and stated that he may be allowed to continue in services in Bombay only. The company by their letter dated 24-11-1988 (Ex. M. 16) informed the workman that his request could not be accepted, and in case he would not report for duty at the new place, it would be a serious misconduct on his part. The workman again by his letter dated 28-11-1988 (Ex. M/18) informed the company that the action of the company in transferring him from Bombay to Tuticorin was malafide, and further stated that he is willing to continue in services in Bombay only. It is true that as per the terms and conditions embodied in the letter for appointment, the company had every right to transfer the said workman from Bombay to any other place in India. However I find that the action of the Bombay in the matter was not just and proper. The said workman was getting a meagre pay of Rs. 750 per month. It is true that his lodging and boarding charges of the first seven days of Tuticorin and his travelling expenses, from Bombay to Tuticorin were to be borne by the company. However, after one week, the necessary arrangements for lodging and boarding were to be made by the workman himself. The workman was transferred from Bombay to Tuticorin only within 1 1/2 years after he joined his services with the company at Bombay. By the said letter of transfer, that workman was transferred from Bombay to Tuticorin which is a very far away place from Bombay and he is quite new to that place. Further as he himself was to make his arrangements for lodging and boarding one week after joining there, he would find it very difficult to make necessary arrangements in the matter. As such the company should not have transferred him from Bombay to Tuticorin, even though the company was entitled to transfer him from Bombay to any other place in India. I therefore find that even though the action of the company in the matter cannot be considered as illegal, still it is not just and proper. The reference made by the Central Government is also whether the action of the company in the matter is justified. (and not whether it is legal). I, therefore, find that the action of the company in the matter is not just and proper.

Issue No. 5 is therefore found in the negative.

The relief to be granted to the workman therefore is that the company management must be directed to issue an order transferring him from Tuticorin to Bombay, and to direct the workman to join his duty in the Bombay office.

11. The following Award is therefore passed :

AWARD

The action of the management of M/s. Sensesap Services Pvt. Ltd. Bombay, in transferring Shri Dillip R. Naik,

Tally Clerk from Bombay Office to Tuticorin office w.e.f. 21-11-1988 and subsequently terminating his services w.e.f. 26-11-1988, is not just and proper.

The management of the said company is hereby directed to issue an order immediately transferring the said workman from Tuticorin to Bombay and to direct the said workman to join his duty at the Bombay office.

The absence in question of the workman since the date he ceased attending to the office at Bombay till he resumes his duties in Bombay shall be treated as his extra ordinary leave without pay, but there will be continuity of services.

The parties to bear their own costs of this reference.
P. D. APSHANKAR, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 जनवरी, 1993

का. आ. 295.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार तामिळनाडु मिनेरल्स लिमिटेड मद्रास 5 के प्रबंधन के संबंध निर्यातकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में औद्योगिक अधिकरण, मद्रास के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करता है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20/1/93 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[संख्या एन—29011/31/91—आई आर (मिस.)]

वा. एम. डेविड, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th January, 1993

S.O. 295.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Industrial Tribunal, Madras-104 as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Tamilnadu Minerals Ltd., Madras-5 and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 20-1-93.

[No. L-29011/31/91-IR(Misc)]

B. M. DAVID, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, TAMIL NADU, MADRAS

Monday, the 28th day of December, 1992

PRESENT :

Thiru M. Gopalaswamy, B.Sc., B.L., Industrial Tribunal.

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE NO. 49 OF 1992

(In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 between the workmen and the management of Tamil Nadu Minerals Ltd., Madras-5.)

BETWEEN :

The workmen represented by

The General Secretary,
Tamil National Employees Union,
C/o. C.I.T.U., Tamilnadu State Committee,
13, Mosque Street, Madras-5.

AND

The Managing Director,
Tamil Nadu Minerals Ltd.,
Twad House, Chepauk, Madras-5.

REFERENCE :

Order No. I-29011/31 91-IR(Misc.), dated 28-5-1992, Ministry of Labour, Government of India, New Delhi.

This dispute coming on this day for final disposal in the presence of Thiru N. Joshi, Advocate appearing for the management, upon perusing the reference and other connected papers on record and the workmen being absent, this Tribunal passed the following :

AWARD

This dispute between the workmen and the management of Tamil Nadu Minerals Limited, Madras-5 arises out of a reference under section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 by the Government of India, in its Order No. L-29011/31/91-IR(Misc), dated 28-5-1992 of the Ministry of Labour, for adjudication of the following issue :

"Whether the management of Tamilnadu Minerals Ltd., Madras is justified in not conceding to the demands raised by Tamil National Employees Union dated 22-9-89 ?"

2. Parties were served with summons.

3. Petitioner-Union was absent and no representation was made on its behalf. The management was represented by counsel.

4. After several adjournments, when the dispute was called today, the Petitioner Union was absent and no representation was made.

5. Hence, industrial dispute is dismissed for default, dated, this 28th day of December, 1992.

THIRU M. GOPALASWAMY, Industrial Tribunal

नई दिल्ली, 27 जनवरी, 1993

का. आ. 296.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार वांमवानी आयरन माईन और दुबना मैंगनीज माईन ऑफ मै. उड़ीसा माईनिंग कारपोरेशन के प्रबन्धन के संबंध निर्योजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निहित औद्योगिक विवाद में औद्योगिक अधिकरण, ओडिशा (भुवनेश्वर) के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-1-93 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[संख्या एन- 26011/11/86 डी-III (बी)/डी. IV (बी)]
बो. एम. डेविड, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 27th January, 1993

S.O. 296.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Industrial Tribunal Orissa (Bhubaneswar) as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Banspani Iron Mine and Dubna Manganese Mines of M/s. Orissa Mines Corporation and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 20th January, 1993.

[No. I-26011/11/86-D.III(B)/IV(B)]

B. M. DAVID, Desk Officer

271 GI/93—9

ANNEXURE

INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, ORISSA, BHUBANESWAR

PRESENT :

Sri R. K. Dash, LL.B., Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal,
Orissa, Bhubaneswar.

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE CASE NO. 60 OF 1987
(CENTRAL)

Dated, Bhubaneswar, the 8th January, 1993

BETWEEN :

The management of Banspani Iron Mine and Dubna Manganese Mines of M/s. Orissa Mining Corporation Ltd., Barbil Zone, P. O. Barbil, Dist. Keonjhar.
.. First Party—Management

AND

Their workmen Sri T. K. Ghosh and Sri P.C. Chhotray represented through The North Orissa Workers Union, At : Oram Pada, P.O. Rourkela, Dist. Sundergarh.
.. Second Party—Workmen.

APPEARANCES :

Sri P. K. Behera, Manager (P and A)—For the first Party—Management.

Sri T. K. Ghosh, one of the second Party—Workman—For the second party workman.

AWARD

The Government of India in the Ministry of Labour in exercise of powers conferred upon it by clause(d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section (2A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1917) have referred the following dispute for adjudication vide their Order No. L-26011/11/86-D.III(B)/IV,B dated 3rd Sept. '87 :

"Whether the action of the management of Orissa Mining Corporation, Bhubaneswar in transferring Sri T.K. Ghosh, Tractor Compressor Operator from Banspani Iron Mine of Barbil Zone to Daitari Iron Mine of Daitari Zone and P.C. Chhotray, Tractor Compressor Operator from Dubna Mn. Mine of Barbil Zone to Munduguda Mine of Jaipur Zone with effect from 8th January, 1986 is malafide ? If so, to what relief the workmen are entitled ?"

2. It is needless to refer to the pleadings of the parties to give a finding on the question as to whether the transfer of two agrieved workmen, namely, T.K. Ghosh and P. C. Chhotray effected by the management was malafide or not for the reason that a compromise has been entered into between Sri T. K. Ghosh and the management and in so far as the other workman Sri P. C. Chhotray is concerned, he has prayed the Tribunal by a separate petition to drop the proceeding. As there is no provision in the Industrial Disputes Act either to drop or dismiss a reference, I am required to give a finding and answer the same.

3. The compromise effected between Sri T.K. Ghosh and the management being fair and proper shall form part of the award. In so far as the workman Sri P.C. Chhotray is concerned, though the action of the management has been challenged in the statement of claims but no evidence has been led to show that with malafide intention the management transferred him from one place to another. This apart, when the workman himself does not want to proceed with the case, it appears that there exist no dispute to be adjudicated upon. Hence, a no dispute award is passed in so far as Sri P.C. Chhotray is concerned.

Dictated and corrected by me.

R. K. DASH, Presiding Officer
FORM 'H'

BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL, ORISSA, BHUBANESWAR

I.D. Case No. 60/1987(C)

BETWEEN :

The Management of Orissa Mining Corpn. Ltd. represented by Sri P. K. Behera, Manager (P and A)

.. 1st Party

AND

Their workman Shri Tusar Kanti Ghosh represented by
B. S. Pal the General Secy. North Orissa Workers'
Union, Rourkela, .. 2nd Party

IN THE MATTER OF PETITION FOR COMPROMISE
OF THE DISPUTE.

The humble petition as aforesaid most respectfully sheweth:

1. That, the following dispute between the parties has been referred by the Ministry of Labour, Govt. of India, New Delhi vide Order No. L-26011/11/86-D.III/IV.B. dated 03-09-87 for adjudication by this Hon'ble Tribunal.

THE SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Orissa Mining Corporation, Bhubaneswar in transferring Shri T.K. Ghosh, Tractor-cum-Compressor Operator from Banspani Iron Mines of Barbil Zone to Daitari Iron Mines of Daitari Zone and Shri P.C. Chhotary, Tractor-cum-Compressor Operator from Dubna Mn. Mines of Barbil Zone to Munaguda Mines of Jey-pore Zone w.e.f. 8th January, '86 is malafide? If so, to what relief the workmen are entitled?"

2. That the Transfer Order which was issued to Shri T.K. Ghosh for joining duty in Daitari Iron Mines and thereafter Shri Gosh represented the management stating difficulties and after considering the fact and circumstances, the transfer was postponed and, now the same stands cancelled.

In view of the above compromise agreed and arrived at by and between the parties, the impugned dispute has been fully and finally settled and that parties have no further course of action to proceed with the case.

PRAYER

The Parties in the circumstances, stated above prays that the above compromise may kindly be accepted as amicable and fair and having compromise the dispute in reference fully and finally and further prays that an award in terms of compromise as aforesaid may kindly be passed order that this joint petition may be confirmed part of the settlement and award with the learned tribunal may be pleased to give in this case.

By the 1st Party :

Sd./-

(P.K. BEHRA)
Representative for the
1st Party Management
The O.M.C. Limited.

By the 2nd Party :

Sd./-

(B.S. PATI)
General Secretary,
North Orissa Workers' Union

Witness :

Sd.-

(MANORANJAN SETHY)
Rajndi

Sd./-

(T.K. GOSH)

Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 10 जनवरी, 1993

का. घा. 297-—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 11) की धारा 17 के अन्वय में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, श्री. सारन कोविन कोव विमि. का मुनीडीह प्रोजेक्ट के प्रवन्धन के संबंध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अन्तर्गत में विवाद औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिनियम, (सं. 1), धनवाद के

पंचायत को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 18-1-93 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एन-20012/183/91-आई आर (कोल-1)]

एच. सी. गौड़, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 19th January, 1993

S.O. 297.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 1) Dhanbad as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Moonidih Project of M/s. B.C.C. Ltd., and their workmen which was received by the Central Government on 15-1-93.

[No. L-20012/183/91-IR (Coal-1)]

HARISH GAUR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, NO. 1, DHANBAD

In the matter of a reference under section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Reference No. 123 of 1991

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Moonidih Project of M/s. B.C.C. Ltd.

AND

Their Workmen.

PRESENT :

Shri S. K. Mitra,
Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers.—Shri B. Joshi, Advocate.

For the Workmen.—Shri D. Mukherjee, Secretary,
Bihar Colliery Kamgar Union.

STATE : Bihar.

INDUSTRY : Coal.

Dated, the 8th January, 1993

AWARD

By Order No. L-20012(183)/91-IR.(Coal-I), dated, the 23th November, 1991, the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour, has, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section (2-A) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal :

"Whether the action of the management of Moonidih Project of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., P.O. Moonidih Dist. Dhanbad in dismissing Sri Jagdish Prasad, Clerk, Gr. II w.e.f. 20/21-6-90 is justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?"

2. The case of the management of Moonidih Project of M/s. B.C.C. Ltd., as disclosed in the written statement-cum-rejoinder, details apart, is as follows :

The present reference is not legally maintainable. Jagdish Prasad, the concerned workman, was working as Bill Clerk of Moonidih Washery under Moonidih Project during the period 1986 and 1987. In the course of performance of his duties as a Bill Clerk during the year 1986 and 1987, the concerned workman committed misconduct of dishonesty by preparing false overtime and Sunday/Holiday bills in favour of workman working at Moonidih Washery. It was ascertained that he prepared overtime bill in respect of Gour Mahato and 12 others named in the chargesheet for more number of hours than they actually worked on overtime during July, 1986 to January, 1987. He also prepared

false bills with regard to the above workmen indicating that they had worked on Sunday, weekly days of rest and holidays during the above period although they were not on duty on Sundays, weekly days of rest and holidays. He was issued with a chargesheet dated 2-3-87 on the allegations of commission of misconduct of theft, fraud or dishonesty in connection with employers business or property under Clause 17(a) of the Model Standing Orders applicable to the establishment of the Washery at Moonidih. He submitted his reply dated 7-3-87 to the chargesheet taking various defence and denying the allegations levelled against him. The management appointed Sri D. Biswas, Dy. Personnel Manager of Moonidih Washery as Enquiry Officer to hold the enquiry into the chargesheet issued against him on 9-3-87. Sri G. H. Bakshi, Sr. Finance Officer, Moonidih Project was appointed Presenting Officer on behalf of the management by the same letter. The departmental enquiry was held in the presence of the chargesheeted workman. The Enquiry Officer submitted his report dated 9-11-89 holding the concerned workman guilty of the misconduct charged against him. The approval of the General Manager of the area for dismissal of the concerned workman from service was obtained and thereafter he was dismissed from service by letter dated 20/21-6-90. The chargesheet was issued under the signature of the Project Officer who is the Agent of the Washery and competent disciplinary authority. He also signed the letter of dismissal after obtaining approval of the General Manager, Moonidih Area. The General Manager was the Chief Mining Engineer in respect of the mines and the washeries falling within Moonidih Area.

3. The case of the concerned workman, as disclosed in the written statement submitted on his behalf by the sponsoring union, Bihar Colliery Kamgar Union, briefly stated, is as follows :

The concerned workman had been working as permanent Clerk Grade-II since long with unblemished record of service. The management issued a false and frivolous chargesheet dated 2-3-87 against the concerned workman for alleged incident from August to November, 1986. The charge-sheet was issued to him under clause 17(1)(a) of the Model Standing Orders applicable to Moonidih Washery. He was chargesheeted for theft, fraud or dishonesty in connection with employer's business or property. He replied to the chargesheet denying the charges levelled against him. He took specific plea that the chargesheet suffers from vagueness, and placed actual facts which were sufficient to withdraw the false charge against him. He also submitted that the alleged billings had been done after the same was approved and verified by the departmental head and that the same also bore the signature of the departmental heads and others. He submitted that by the alleged act of billing he had made no personal gain and so the question of theft, fraud or dishonesty in connection with the employer's business or property does not arise. Despite this fact, the anti-labour management constituted a departmental enquiry through a bias and prejudiced Enquiry Officer. The Enquiry Officer was also appointed by an unauthorised person. The enquiry was conducted in a most unfair manner and it was not held in conformance to the principles of natural justice. The Enquiry Officer held the concerned workman guilty of doing cutting in the absentee statement dishonesty against 13 persons which was not the subject-matter of the chargesheet. The finding of the Enquiry Officer is perverse and not based on evidence on record. The anti-labour management without appreciating the legal position dismissed him from service with effect from 20/21-6-90. He represented before the management against illegal and arbitrary dismissal order, but without any effect. Seeing no other alternative he raised the industrial dispute before the A.L.C.(C), Dhanbad and upon failure of conciliation proceeding due to adamant attitude of the management, the appropriate Government has been pleased to refer the dispute for adjudication by this Tribunal. It has been submitted that the chargesheet was issued under Model Standing Orders which is itself illegal and it was issued by an unauthorised person. The Enquiry Committee was constituted by unauthorised person and the enquiry was conducted in a most perfunctory manner. In the circumstances, the concerned workman has prayed that he be reinstated in

service with retrospective effect alongwith arrear of wage and consequential benefits.

4. In rejoinder to the written statement of the union, the management has admitted that the concerned workman was working as Clerk Grade-II. The management has denied that the chargesheet was false and frivolous. It has been asserted that the concerned workman dishonestly prepared false bills for getting benefits to him at the cost of financial loss to the management. The contention of his reply to the chargesheet will indicate that he tried to justify his false charges by shifting his responsibility to officers. It is not correct that he prepared the bills after the same were approved by the officers. Anyway, the officers signed the bills in good faith considering that the concerned workman prepared the bills as per the records available to him. Providing financial gain to others and causing financial loss to the management amounts to dishonesty and it is not necessary to establish if the concerned workman got money from the concerned persons or not and the modus operandi used in this case. These are irrelevant so far as the misconduct of dishonesty is concerned. It has been asserted that the Enquiry Officer was appointed rightly by authorised person and that the domestic enquiry was held in conformance to the principles of natural justice. The report of the Enquiry Officer is fair and does not suffer from perversity. The chargesheet was issued under the signature of an authorised person.

5. In rejoinder to the written statement of the management, the sponsoring union has denied and disputed every facts relied on by the management and also the facts which imping on the conduct of the concerned workman.

6. At the instance of the management the fairness and propriety of the domestic enquiry was considered as preliminary issue. At the time of hearing on preliminary issue, the management produced the entire domestic enquiry proceedings which were marked Exts. M-1 to M-9 on formal proof being dispensed with.

At the time of hearing argument on preliminary issue, Shri D. Mukherjee, Secretary of Bihar Colliery Kamgar Union conceded that the domestic enquiry was held fairly and properly. Accordingly, it was held that the domestic enquiry was held fairly and properly. Thereafter the case was heard on merits.

7. Admittedly, Jagdish Prasad, the concerned workman was working as Clerk Grade-II and functioning as Bill Clerk of Moonidih Washery under Moonidih Project during the period 1986 and 1987. It is alleged by the management that in the course of performance of his duty as Bill Clerk during the year 1986-87 he prepared overtime bills in respect of Gour Mahato and 12 others for more number of hours than these workmen actually worked on overtime during the period from July, 1986 to January, 1987. It is further alleged that he also prepared false bills with regard to these workmen showing them to be on duty on Sunday, weekly days of rest and holidays during the above period although they were not on duty on Sunday, weekly days of rest and holidays. The management issued him with a chargesheet dated 2-3-87 on the allegation of commission of misconduct of theft, fraud or dishonesty in connection with employers business or property under Clause 17(1)(a) of the Model Standing Orders applicable to the establishment of the washery at Moonidih Project.

The concerned workman has denied the charge levelled against him and asserted that all the alleged billings had been done after the same was approved and verified by the departmental heads and these bills also bore the signatures of departmental heads and others and that by so billing he had made no personal gain and so the question of theft, fraud and dishonesty in connection with employers business or property does not arise.

8. Anyway the charge sheet issued to the concerned workman dated 2nd March, 1987 by the Project Officer, Moonidih Washery is reproduced herciabelow (Ext. M-1) :

"While scrutinising the attendance sheet of time office and attendance format for the months of August, September, October and November, 1986 it has been found that the billing in respect of the following employees has been done excess than what they

actually worked.

Name	Cata No.	Particulars of excess billing
1. Sri Gour Mahato	322	Against Sunday & O.T.
2. Sri Dhanu Bauri	349	-do-
3. Sri Manowar Meah	347	-do-
4. Sri Sarfuddin Ansari	364	-do-
5. Sri Tulshi Mahato	346	-do-
6. Sri Nagender Jha	357	-do-
7. Sri R. P. Roy	356	-do-
8. Sri T. P. Singh	359	-do-
9. Sri Nuzrul Islam	361	-do-
10. Sri Sohrai Nunia	474	-do-
11. Sri Jagan Modak	382	-do-
12. Sri Dharampal	365	-do-
13. Sri Jailal	366	-do-

This is a serious misconduct on your part under clause 17(1)(a) of Model Standing Order applicable to Moonidih Washery which reads as under :—

17(i)(a) Theft, fraud or dishonesty in connection with the employer business or property.

You are therefore directed to explain in writing within 48 hrs. of the receipt of this letter why disciplinary action should not be taken against you for your aforesaid misconduct. Should you fail to submit your explanation within the stipulated time it will be presumed that you have no explanation to offer and further action in this matter will be taken accordingly.

Pending enquiry you are suspended forthwith."

In reply, the concerned workman has totally denied the charges. His reply also is re-produced herembelow (M-2):

"I have received your charge sheet No. BCCL/MWP/87/820 dated 2nd March, 1987, the contents of which has caused great disappointment to me. I am also surprised and despaired to see the charges in the above letter levelled against me. It is a matter of great concern that my sincere working for last four years in the washery has not at all been considered and taken in view before framing such false, fabricated and ambiguous charges against me.

However, my reply to the above mentioned chargesheet is as follows :—

1. That the charges levelled against is vague ambiguous and is not tenable. It is also not specific. As such it is denied.
2. That, the contents of the charges reveals that during the scrutiny it has been found that billing in respect of 13 persons as mentioned in the letter, has been made excess than what they have actually worked. It is a matter of great surprise as to how the billing check will know the actual working period of O.T. or Sunday except that what is sent to him by the time section and departmental heads in the statement.
3. That hours of actual working and the hours of O.T. and Sunday billed in the format against the 13 persons has not been specifically mentioned in the chargesheet so that I can know the full facts. As such, the charges as mentioned in the above letter and conveyed to me are vague, unspecific and having no basis and seems to be imaginary.
4. That since the time of my posting in the bill section I have been always posting the hours of O.T. and Sunday in the format what has been sent to me by the time section and subsequently rectified by the departmental heads. The sheets are also finally signed by the departmental heads. I assure that there have been no variations between the hours posted in the format and as mentioned in the sheets finally verified by the departmental heads in respect of these 13 persons.
5. That, while verifying and rectifying the sheets of O.T. sent by the time section the departmental heads used to make lot of cutting and rewriting in the sheets which has always been communicated to the Ex-Project Officer and to you. I have also objected

many times for billing on the basis of such sheets which bears lot of cutting but I was all the time compelled to prepare format of bill by the Ex-Project Officer and later on by you. The sheets of O.T. and Sunday working will reveal the fact themselves.

6. In the chargesheet, I find that scrutiny was made by some persons of the sheets before framing the charges against me. But, I do not understand any reason why I was not consulted while the scrutiny was made so that I could get the opportunity to expose the facts. It was thus, a one sided scrutiny and it carries no meaning and it was vitiated and a prejudiced one.

7. That in this whole affair I feel that the attempt is being made to shift the responsibility on me with prejudiced motive of some persons who want to protect themselves.

8. That, the hours of O.T. and Sunday working of the period mentioned in the charge sheet against thirteen (13) persons have been posted the same what was sent to me by the time section and Departmental heads. If there was any difference in the actual working hours and as mentioned in the sheet sent to me the responsibility was with the time section and the departmental heads and not with me.

In the light of above it is requested that the baseless charges framed against me may kindly be withdrawn and I may kindly be allowed to resume my duty forthwith."

9. The concerned workman has taken the stance in his reply to the chargesheet that the charge levelled against him is vague and ambiguous.

Shri D. Mukherjee, authorised representative of the concerned workman, has submitted that the charge suffers from infirmity of vagueness and ambiguity.

It is essential that charge shall contain such particulars as to the time and place of alleged offence and the person, if any, against whom, or thing, if any, in respect of which it is committed as are reasonably sufficient to give the person proceeded against notice of the matter with which he is charged. When the nature of the case is such that the particulars mentioned above do not give the person proceeded against sufficient notice of the matter with which he is charged, the charge shall also contain such particulars of the matter in which the alleged offence was committed as will be sufficient for the purpose.

Upon perusal of the chargesheet it appears that it has revealed the time and place of the misconduct, but the particulars of the manner in which the misconduct was committed have not been spelt out precisely. I consider that it was bounden duty of the management to spell out the particulars of the manner in which the alleged misconduct was committed by the concerned workman. That not being done, I hold that the charge suffers from infirmity of vagueness and ambiguity.

10. Shri D. Mukherjee has further submitted that the chargesheet was issued under Clause 17(1)(a) of the Model Standing Orders applicable to Moonidih Washery by the Project Officer, Moonidih Washery and that there is no evidence on record to show that the Project Officer, Moonidih Washery was the Agent or Manager of Moonidih Colliery and Washery. According to him, the charge-sheet was issued by an incompetent person.

Shri B. Joshi has submitted that Moonidih Colliery and Washery was under N.C.D.C. and that the Corporation had the Certified Standing Orders of its own. Clause 17(1)(a) of the Certified Standing Orders is comparable to Clause 17(1)(a) of the Model Standing Orders and powers were delegated to all Project Officers of the Washery. In terms of Clause 17(2) of the Certified Standing Orders (Coal Mines) the power for an approval of punishment has referred to in the Certified Standing Orders was given to Project Officers among others. This may be the position with regard to the establishment under N.C.D.C., but here the chargesheet was issued under the provision of Model Standing Orders. There is no evidence to indicate that the Project Officer of Moonidih Washery was the Agent of Moonidih Colliery and Washery. Hence, I find substance in the contention of Shri Mukherjee that the evidence of the management is faulted on the score that the charge sheet was issued by a competent person.

11. It appears that although the chargesheet was issued under the provision of Model Standing Orders the order of dismissal was issued to the concerned workman by the Project Officer of Moonidih Project. There is no evidence on record that the Project Officer of Moonidih Project was the Agent of Moonidih Project including its colliery and washery. I consider that on this ground also the dismissal of the concerned workman from service was also illegal.

12. It appears from the enquiry report that the Enquiry Officer has noticed some 'cuttings and overwritings' in the absentee statement of the workman. In his statement before the Enquiry Officer, the concerned workman has stated that the absentee statements reach the Personnel Department after routing through all the departments and from the Personnel Department the statements reach the Planning Officer and thereafter the statements reach the Bill Section with the signature of the Planning Officer. According to absentee report, O.T. Sunday, Hazari or whatever more is payable is noted in the attendance format and then after obtaining the signature of the Personnel Department the statement is sent to Machine Section. The Enquiry Officer has held that while filling up the format of the bill it was duty of the concerned workman to see that 'cutting & overwritings' in the absentee statement must be countersigned by the Departmental Head in order to ascertain authenticity of checking. According to him, if there is no signature against such cuttings and overwritings he should have immediately approached to get the signature of the concerned Sectional Head or he should have reported the matter to the Project Officer to get the thing done. In other words, the Enquiry Officer has put entire buck on the concerned workman sparing the concerned Departmental Head and other employees whose duty it was to countersign the so-called 'cuttings and overwritings'. In his reply to the chargesheet the concerned workman has written to the Project Officer that 'while verifying and rectifying the O.T. sent by the Time Section, the Departmental Head used to make a lot of cuttings and re-writings in the sheets which has always been communicated to the Ex-Project Officer and to you. I have also objected many times for billing on the basis of such sheets which bears lot of cutting but I was all the time used to prepare format of bill by the Ex-Project Officer and later on by you'. Such is the asseveration of the concerned workman in his reply to the chargesheet and in the circumstances I consider that it was the duty of the management to examine the concerned Project Officer to vouch for the fact as to whether the statement of the concerned workman as revealed in his reply to the chargesheet is correct or not. Anyway, from the evidence on record there is reason to doubt as to whether so-called 'cuttings and overwritings' in the absentee statements were done by the concerned workman.

13. The charge against the concerned workman is for theft, fraud or dishonesty in connection with employers business or property. In the present case there is no ingredient of theft having been committed by the concerned workman. He has made no personal gain by over payment to 13 different workmen. No men-rea for commission of theft or dishonesty has been suggested or proved by the management. Shri D. Mukherjee has submitted that the management has since recovered excess payments made to the employees from the employees concerned. No denial of this fact has been made by the management. Deceit is an essential element of fraud. But there is no evidence on record to indicate that the concerned workman has resorted to deceit in order to strike the transactions.

Not it remains to be considered whether he has acted dishonestly in the matter. Whoever does anything with the intention of causing wrongful gain to one person or wrongful loss to another person is said to do that thing dishonestly. Wrongful gain is the gain by unlawful means of property to which the person gaining is not legally entitled.

Wrongful loss is loss by unlawful means of property to which the person losing it is legally entitled.

A person is said to gain wrongfully, when such person retains wrongfully, as well as when such person acquires wrongfully. A person is said to lose wrongfully when such person is wrongfully kept out of any property as well as when such person is wrongfully deprived of property.

The concerned workman has not gained anything by excess payment. He has not also retained anything wrongfully. Apart from this, the intention of his causing wrongful loss to his employer is absolutely wanting. This being so, I hold firmly that the concerned workman was not guilty of theft, fraud or dishonesty in connection with company's property or busi-

ness. Hence, in my view, the Enquiry Officer was not justified in holding the concerned workman guilty of the charge and subsequently the dismissal of the concerned workman from service by the management is not justified. He should be reinstated in service with effect from the date of dismissal from service with full back wages, continuity of service and other benefits.

14. Accordingly, the following award is rendered the action of the management of Moonidih Project of M/s. B.C.C. Ltd., P.O. Moonidih, District Dhanbad, in dismissing Jagdish Prasad, Clerk Gr. II with effect from 20th/21st June, 1990 is not justified. The management is directed to reinstate him in service with effect from the date of his dismissal from service and to pay him back wages from the aforesaid date with continuity of service and other benefits. The management is further directed to reinstate him in service within one month from the date of publication of the award. The concerned workman is also directed to report for duty within the time stipulated.

In the circumstances of the case, I award no cost.

S. K. MITRA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 19 जनवरी, 1993

का. ग्रा. 298.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, मी. भारत कोकिंग कोल लिमि. की भुरकुंदा कोलियरी के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निविष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, (सं. 1), धनबाद के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 15-1-93 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल. 20012/100/90/-आई आर (कोल-1)]

एच. सी. गोड, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 19th January, 1993

S.O. 298.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 1) Dhanbad as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Bhurkunda Colliery of M/s. BCCL and their workmen which was received by the Central Government on 15-1-93.

[No. L-20012/100/90-IR (Coal-I)]

HARISH GAUR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 1, DHANBAD

In the matter of a reference under Sec. 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act

Reference No. 120 of 1991

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the management of Bhurkunda Colliery of M/s. C.C. Ltd.

AND

Their workmen.

PRESENT:

Shri S. K. Mitra, Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES:

For the Employers—Shri R. S. Murthy, Advocate.

For the Workmen—Shri J. D. Lall, Advocate.
(Final hearing—none).

STATE : Bihar.

INDUSTRY : Coal.

Dated, the 6th January, 1993

AWARD

By Order No. L-20012(100)/90-I.R. (Coal-I), Jated 'nil', the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour, has, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section (2-A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal:

"Whether the action of the management of Bhurkunda Colliery of C.C.L., P.O. Bhurkunda, Dist. Hazaribagh by not regularising Shri Ramsurat, Blacksmith in Cat. VI w.e.f. 8-8-81 and not making payment of difference of wages w.e.f. 1-9-86 and onwards is justified? If not, to what relief the workman concerned is entitled?"

2. The order of the reference was received in the office of the Tribunal on 5-12-91. After receipt of the order of reference, notice was sent to the Branch President, Indian National Coal Mines Engineering Workers Association P.O. Bhurkunda, Dist. Hazaribagh for appearance and filing written statement on behalf of the worker. In spite of several adjournments neither the sponsoring union nor the concerned worker has taken any step to file written statements in this case. In the circumstances, I am constrained to pass 'no dispute award in the present case.

3. Accordingly, I pass 'no dispute' award in the present case.

In the circumstances of the case, I award no cost.
This is my award.

Sd/-

S. K. MITRA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 19 जनवरी, 1993

का. आ. 299.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 33सी-(2) के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, मै. भारत कॉकिंग कोल लिमि. की लोयाबाद कोलियरी के प्रबन्धन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कार्यकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, (सं. 1), धनबाद के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 18-1-93 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं एल-20025/6/93-आई आर (कोल-I)]

एच. सी. गौड़, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 19th January, 1993

S.O. 299.—In pursuance of Section 33C(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 1) Dhanbad as shown in the Annexure in the management of Loyabad Colliery of M/s. BCCL and their workmen which was received by the Central Government on 15-1-93.

[No. L-2002/5/6/93-IR(Coal.I)]

HARISH GAUR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT LABOUR
COURT NO. 2, DHANBAD

Application under Sec. 33-C(2) of the I.D. Act. 1947
I.C. Application No. 26 of 1990

Sri Radheshyam, Prop. Mazdoor, Loyabad Colliery, C/o Sri B. K. Ghosh, Member Executive Committee, Janta Mazdoor Sangh, Vihar Building, Jharia... Applicant.

Versus

Manager, Loyabad Colliery of M/s. B.C.C. Ltd., P.O. Bansjora, Dist. Dhanbad.... Opp. Party.

PRESENT :

Shri S. K. Mitra, Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES :

For the Applicant—Shri B. K. Ghosh, Member Executive Committee, Janta Mazdoor Sangh,

For the Opp. Party—Shri B. Joshi, Advocate.

STATE : Bihar.

INDUSTRY : Coal.

Dated, the 8th January, 1993

ORDER

The applicant, Radheshyam, has preferred this present application under Section 33-C(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act against the Opp. Party, his employer, Manager, Loyabad Colliery of M/s. B.C.C. Ltd. laying a claim for Rs. 23,851.51.

2. The case of the applicant is that he was appointed in M/s. B.C.C. Ltd. in March, 1981 and acquired permanent status. But he was stopped from work from 10-11-87 wrongly. He was directed to submit fresh identification certificate which ultimately caused his forced idleness. A dispute has been raised before the A.L.C. (C), Dhanbad on 7-4-89 against the stoppage from duty. He is entitled to receive wages from 10-11-87 to 6-4-89 under the Payment of Wages Act, 1936 which, as per computation comes to Rs. 23,851.51.

3. The Opp. Party—management contested the matter by submitting written statement-cum-rejoinder. The written statement-cum-rejoinder discloses that the present application is not maintainable. The applicant assumed the name of Radheshyam, a delisted casual wagon loader of Sendra Bansjora Colliery and entered into service of the management surreptitiously as Badli miner/loader in 1981 in pursuance of circular dated 4-8-80 of the management. He was transferred from Sendra Bansjora Colliery to Loyabad Colliery on 22-11-83 as miner/loader. It was reported to the management that the applicant was not a genuine workman. He was directed by several letters to produce the certificate of B.D.O. under whose jurisdiction his village is situated so that he could be allowed to work. The applicant failed to produce any certificate of his genuinity. He is not a genuine workman, his initial appointment was irregular and the management was justified in stopping him from duty.

4. In rejoinder to the written statement of the management, the concerned applicant has stated that the action of the management in stopping him from work is the subject matter of industrial dispute and the same is pending before the Ministry of Labour. He was on the roll of the colliery establishment and his stoppage from work amounts to forced idleness. He is entitled to receive wages from the date of stoppage from 10-11-87.

5. In rejoinder to the written statement of the applicant, the management has stated that stoppage of work of the applicant was not wrong or illegal. The workman may be stopped from duty without issuing chargesheet or holding enquiry, if his appointment is irregular and illegal. The applicant is not a genuine workman. Calculations given in the annexure are incorrect.

6. The applicant has examined himself as WW-1 and laid in evidence one item of document, viz. pay slip which has been marked Ext. W-1.

The Opp. Party has not laid any evidence, either oral or documentary.

7. The applicant has stated that he got appointment in Sendra Bansjora Colliery of M/s. B.C.C. Ltd. as miner. The management has not disputed the fact that he got employment in Sendra Bansjora Colliery. The applicant has stated that he was transferred to Loyabad Colliery as Prop Mazdoor. The management has also stated in its written statement that he was transferred from Sendra Bansjora Colliery to Loyabad Colliery on 22-11-83 as miner/loader.

8. The case of the Opp. Party is that the applicant is not a genuine workman and he was asked to produce the certificate of genuinity from the local B.D.O. The applicant has stated in his testimony that he was granted ten days time to produce certificate and he could produce the same after ex-Party has not dispensed with the service of the applicant. stopped him from service. Anyway, the management has stopped him from service with effect from 10-11-87.

9. It has been contended by the management that it has right to stop him from duty as the initial appointment of the applicant is illegal. But this is a matter of evidence, the management has not laid any whit of evidence to prove this fact. By the action of the management—Opp. Party, the applicant was subjected to force idleness. The Opp. Party has not dispensed with the service of the applicant. This being so, the applicant has remained in the employment of the management—Opp. Party as before and the management—Opp. Party is responsible for payment of all wages to the applicant as he continued to remain employed by it.

10. The applicant has computed his wages for the period from 10-11-87 to 6-4-89 which includes Basic, Attendance Bonus, Spl. D.A., F.D.A. and V.D.A. at Rs. 23,851.51. The pay slip produced by him (Ext. W-1) supports his claim in some material respects. The applicant has not been cross-examined on the point and his cross-examination does not reveal that his computation is any way faulted. This being the position, I allow the entire claim of the applicant.

11. Hence ordered—that the L.C. case be disposed of on contest. The applicant is entitled to recover a sum of Rs. 23,851.51 from the Opp. Party—management. The Opp. Party—management is directed to pay the amount to the applicant within two months from the date of notification of the order.

Sd/-

S. K. MITRA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 जनवरी, 1993

का. अ. 300.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, मै. भारत कोकिंग कोल लिमि. की भोवरा (नार्थ) कोलियरी के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निहित औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, (सं. 1), धनबाद के पंचवट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 19-1-93 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

(उप-20012/199/89-आई आर (कोल-I))

एच. सी. गौड़, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th January, 1993

S.O. 300.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 1), Dhanbad as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Bhowra (North) Colliery of M/s. BCCL and their workmen which was received by the Central Government on 19-1-1993.

[No. L-20012(199)/89-IR(Coal-I)]
HARISH GAUR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 1, DHANBAD

In the matter of a reference under section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

Reference No. 215 of 1990

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Bhowra (North) Colliery of M/s. B.C.C. Ltd.

AND

Their Workmen.

PRESENT :

Shri S. K. Mitra, Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers : Shri R. S. Murthy, Advocate.

For the Workmen : Shri B. M. Lal, Advocate.

STATE : Bihar.

INDUSTRY : Coal.

Dated, the 13th January, 1993

AWARD

The present reference arises out of Order No. L-20012(199)/89-IR(Coal-I) dated, the 20th September, 1990 passed by the Central Government in respect of an industrial dispute between the parties mentioned above. The subject matter of the dispute has been specified in the schedule to the said order and the said schedule runs as follows :

"Whether the action of the management of Bhowra (N) Colliery of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Limited in recording wrong date of birth of Shri Ghogan Dhobi D. C. Loader is justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled to?"

2. The dispute has been settled out of Court. A memorandum of settlement has been filed in Court. I have gone through the terms of settlement and I find them quite fair and reasonable. There is no reason why an award should not be passed on the basis of terms and conditions laid down in the memorandum of settlement. I accept it and pass an award accordingly. The memorandum of settlement shall form part of the award.

3. Let a copy of this award be sent to the Ministry as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

S. K. MITRA, Presiding Officer

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 1, DHANBAD

Reference No. 215/90

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the Management of Bhowra (North) Colliery of Bharat Coking Coal Ltd P.O. Bhowra, District Dhanbad,

AND

Their workmen.

JOINT COMPROMISE PETITION OF EMPLOYERS AND WORKMEN.

The above mentioned Employers and the Workmen/Bihar La Jhanda Mazdoor Union most respectfully beg to submit jointly as follows :—

(1) That the Employers and the workmen/Bihar La Jhanda Mazdoor Union have jointly negotiated the matter jointly with a view to arriving at an amicable and mutual settlement of the matter covered by the above reference.

(2) That as a result of such mutual negotiations between the two parties, they have agreed to settle the matter on the following terms and conditions :—

(a) It is agreed that Sri Ghoghan Dhobi, the workman concerned will be got examined by the Management through its Apex Medical Board within three months of this joint compromise petition being accepted by the Hon'ble Tribunal, for determining/assessing his age at present i.e. on the date of medical examination.

(b) It is agreed that if the age of Sri Ghoghan Dhobi is assessed by the Apex Medical Board as 60 years or above on the date of medical examination, he will not be entitled to any wages or benefit whatsoever and he will stand retired w.e.f. 1-7-1990 as was done by the Management already.

(c) It is agreed that if, however, the age of Sri Ghoghan Dhobi is assessed by the Apex Medical Board on the date of medical examination as below 60 years, he will be employed by the Management for the remaining period till he attains the age of 60 years as per the said assessment of his age by the Apex Medical Board and he will be paid 40 per cent of his wages for the period from 1-7-1990 and the date of his resuming duty.

(d) It is agreed that this is an overall settlement in full and final settlement of all the claims of Sri Ghoghan Dhobi and the Bihar Lal Jhanda Mazdoor Union arising out of the above reference.

(3) That the employers and the workman concerned/sponsoring Union hereby declare and confirm that they consider the above terms of settlement as fair, just and reasonable to both the parties.

In view of the above, both the parties pray jointly that the Hon'ble Tribunal may be pleased to accept this joint compromise petition and give an award in terms of the same and dispose of the above reference.

Sd./-

(RAGHUNANDAN RAD),
Working President,
Bihar Mines Lal Jhanda
Mazdoor Union
For and on behalf of
workmen.

T. Impression,
(GHOCHAN DHOBI),
Workman concerned.

Agent,
Bhowra (North) Colliery,
Bharat Coking Coal Ltd.,
For and on behalf of
Employers.

Sd./-

(BHAGWAN PRASAD),
Dy. Chief Personnel Manager,
Bhowra Area,
Bharat Coking Coal Ltd.,
For and on behalf of
Employers.

Sd./- Illegible.

Dhanbad,

Dated : 11-1-1993.

(RAL. S. MURTHY),
Advocate,
For Employers.

Part of the Award,
Sd/- Illegible
S. K. MITRA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 19 जनवरी, 1993

का. घा. 301.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार गार्थ ईस्टर्न रेलवे लब्बर के प्रबन्धन के संघर्ष नियोजनों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अनुबंध में निहित औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण कानपुर के पंचवट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 18-1-93 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं एन.-41012/74/89-आई आर (डी.यू.) (पी टी)]

के. बी. बी. उन्नी, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 19th January, 1993

S.O. 301.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Kanpur as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of North Eastern Railway, Lucknow and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 18-1-1993.

[No. L-41012/74/89-IR(DU)(Pt.)]

K. V. B. UNNY, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SRI ARJAN DEV, PRESIDING OFFICER,
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-
CUM-LABOUR COURT, PANDU NAGAR, KANPUR

Industrial Dispute No. 103 of 1990

In the matter of dispute between :

The General Secretary,
Purvottar Railway Shramik Sangh,
6, Naveen Market, Kaisar Bagh,
Lucknow.

AND

Senior Divisional Personnel Officer,
N.E.R., Ashok Marg,
Lucknow.

AWARD

1. The Central Government, Ministry of Labour, vide its Notification No. L-41012/74/89/I.R.D.U. dated nil has referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal :

Whether the Sr. Divisional Personnel Officer, N.E.R., Lucknow was justified in terminating the services of Sri Ram Shanker w.e.f. 22-8-85? If not what relief the workman was entitled to?

2. On 2-12-92, when the case was taken for the cross-examination of the Union witness, none appeared for the Union. Sri R. L. Srivastava appeared for the management. In this case 26-11-91 was the first date fixed for cross-examination of Union witness on 25-9-91 and today's is the 8th date.

3. It, therefore, from the conduct of the Union, appears that the Union is not interested in prosecuting the case any more.

4. Therefore, a no claim award is given against the Union.

5. Reference is answered accordingly.

ARJAN DEV, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 जनवरी, 1993

का. घा. 302.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में

केन्द्रीय सरकार टेलीकॉम डिस्ट्रिक्ट इंजीनियर, करनाल के प्रबन्धन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निदिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण चंडीगढ़ के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 19-1-93 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एन-40012/78/88-डी. 2 (बी) (पीटी.)]

के. वी. बी. उण्णी, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th January, 1993

S.O. 302.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Chandigarh as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Telecom Distt. Engineer, Karnal and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 19-1-1993.

[No. L-40012/78/88-D.II(B)(Pt.)]

K. V. B. UNNY, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI ARVIND KUMAR, PRESIDING OFFICER,
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-
CUM-LABOUR COURT, CHANDIGARH

Case No. 122/89

Ram Chander Vs. Telecommunication.

For the workman : Shri H. S. Bath.

For the management : Shri Arun Walia.

AWARD

Central Government vide Gazette Notification No. L-40012/78/88/D.2.(B), dated 1-8-1989 issued U/s. 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the action of the Telecommunication Distt. Engg., Karnal in terminating the services of Shri Ram Chander S/o Sadhu Ram, casual worker w.e.f. 1-8-87 and again on 1-8-1988 is just, fair and legal? If not, to what relief the worker concerned is entitled to?"

2. In the statement of claim it has been alleged that the petitioner has put in more than one year of service with the respondent management as mazdoor to the satisfaction of the respondent. It is further alleged that his appointment was through employment exchange and there was no break in the service. He has further alleged that his services were illegally terminated on 1-8-1987 without any legal notice, without payment of retrenchment compensation alongwith retrenchment order which is condition precedent and thus the respondent management has violated the provisions of section 25-F of the I.D. Act, 1947. It is further alleged that the respondent management has violated the provisions of section 25-F and H of the I.D. Act, 1947 as juniors namely Aditya Prashad and Dharamvir have been retained in the service. It is further alleged that there is lot of work with the telecommunication department and there is no need to retrench the workman petitioner. It is also alleged that he has put in more than 240 days service with the respondent management and prayed that he be reinstated with full back wages and continuity of service.

3. The claim of the petitioner was contested. It has been pleaded that the services of the petitioner was terminated w.e.f. 1-8-87. It was admitted that the retrenchment compensation was given on 9-10-87 and thus provisions of Section 25-F of the I.D. Act, 1947 has been complied. Other contentions were denied. It is further pleaded that no juniors have been retained and thus there is no violation of Section 25-F and H and prayed for dismissal of the reference.

4. Replication was also filed reasserting the claim made in the claim petition.

271 GI/93—10

5. The petitioner in support of his case produced himself as WW1 and filed his affidavit Ex. W1 in evidence and also relied on documents Ex. W2 to W4 the circulars. Respondent management produced Shri G. S. Bains MW1 who tender his affidavit Ex. M1 and relied on the documents Exs. M2 to M3 showing payment of retrenchment compensation and Exs. M4 to M5 the documents showing the number of days put in by the workman. In cross-examination he has admitted that no notice issued to the workman retrenching him, no reason was given. He has also admitted in cross-examination that alongwith the said notice no retrenchment compensation was given to the workman.

6. I have heard both the parties and gone through the evidence on the record. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of workman has argued that the respondent management has violated the provisions of Section 25-F of the I.D. Act, 1947 as the workman was not paid retrenchment compensation alongwith retrenchment order which is condition precedent although the petitioner has completed 240 days in the preceding year to the date of retrenchment. I find force in this contention. Services of the petitioner were terminated w.e.f. 1-8-87. Ex. M4 and Ex. M5 are the muster rolls showing the number of days put in by the petitioner in the preceding year to the date of retrenchment. The petitioner has completed the service of 240 days continuously in the preceding year to the date of retrenchment. Clause 'B' of Section 25-F lays down that as a precondition to retrenchment as the workman should be paid compensation at the time of retrenchment. This condition is a condition precedent to a valid order of retrenchment. If, therefore no retrenchment compensation is paid to the workman before they are asked to go, retrenchment order is had invalid and inoperative in law. If, retrenchment order is invalid, ab-initio, subsequent payment of compensation cannot validate it. From the documents Exs. M2 to M3 it is apparent that the retrenchment compensation was offered only on 9-10-1987 although the termination was effected w.e.f. 1-8-87. Not only this the management's witness Shri G. S. Bains MW1 has also admitted to this effect. If any authority is needed 1970(2) L.L.J. page 179 Somu Kumar Chatterjee Vs. District Signal Telecommunication Engineer and 1967(2) L.L.J. page 23 National Iron and Steel Co. Vs. State of West Bengal can be read in this regard.

In view of the discussion made in the earlier paras. the termination of the petitioner is certainly bad in the eye of law and is set aside. He is ordered to be reinstated with continuity of service with all consequential benefits.

However, with regard to the back wages, the petitioner in the statement of claim has nowhere stated that he remained unemoloyed through out nor such stand has been taken during the course of evidence. In all fairness the petitioner is awarded only 50 per cent of the back wages that too w.e.f. the date of reference i.e. 1-8-1989.

Announced. Subject to the approval
by the Ministry of Labour.
3-12-1992.

ARVIND KUMAR, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 जनवरी, 1993

का. आ. 303 :—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार टेलीकॉम डिस्ट्रिक्ट इंजीनियर, करनाल के प्रबन्धन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निदिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण चंडीगढ़ के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 19-1-93 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एन-40012/74/88-डी 2 (बी) (पीटी.)]

के. वी. बी. उण्णी, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th January, 1993

S.O. 303.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Chandigarh as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Telecommunication Distt Engineer Karnal and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 19-1-93.

[No. L-40012/74/88-DII(B)(Pt)]

K. V. B. UNNY, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI ARVIND KUMAR PRESIDING OFFICER,
CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM.
LABOUR COURT, CHANDIGARH-160017.

Case No. I.D. 120/89

Karam Chand Vs. Telecommunication .

For the workman : Shri H. S. Bath.

For the management : Shri Arun Walia.

AWARD

Central Govt. vide gazette notification No. L-40012/74/88, D 2B dated 1-8-1989 issued U/s 10(I)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the action of the management of Telecommunication Distt. Engineer, Karnal in terminating the services of Shri Karam Chand S/o Tuls Ram, mazdoor w.e.f. 1-8-87 is just, fair and legal ? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to ?"

2. In the statement of claim it has been alleged that the petitioner has put in more than one year of service with the respdt. management as mazdoor to the satisfaction of the respdt. It is further alleged that his appointment was through employment exchange and there was no break in the service. He has further alleged that his services were illegally terminated on 1-8-87 without any legal notice, without payment of retrenchment compensation alongwith retrenchment order which is condition precedent and thus the respdt. management has violated the provisions of section 25-F of the I.D. Act, 1947. It is further alleged that the respdt. management has violated the provisions of Section 25-G and H of the I.D. Act, 1947 as juniors namely Aditya Prashad and Dharambir have been retained in the service. It is further alleged that there is lot of work with the telecommunication department and there is no need to retrench the workmen/petitioner. It is also alleged that he has put in more than 240 days service with the respdt. management and prayed that he be reinstated with full back wages and continuity of service.

3. The claim of the petitioner was contested. It had been pleaded that the services of the petitioner was terminated w.e.f. 1-8-87. It was admitted that the retrenchment compensation was given on 9-10-87 and thus provisions of Section 25-F of the I.D. Act, 1947 has been complied. Other contentions were denied. It is further pleaded that no juniors have been retained and thus there is no violation of Section 25-G and H and prayed for dismissed of the reference.

4. Replication was also filed reasserting the claim made in the claim petition.

5. The petitioner in support of his case produced himself as WW1 and filed his affidavit Ex. W1 in evidence and also relied on documents Ex. W2 to W4 the circulars. Residt. management produced Shri G. S. Bains MW1 who tender his affidavit Ex. M1 and relied on the documents Ex. M2 to M3 showing payment of retrenchment compensation and Ex. M4 to M5 the documents showing the number of day put in by the workman. In cross-examination he has admitted that no notice issued to the workman retrenching him no reason was given. He has also admitted in cross-examination that along with the said notice no retrenchment compensation was given to the workman.

6. I have heard both the parties and gone through the evidence on the record. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of workman has argued that the respdt. management has violated the provisions of Section 25-F of the I.D. Act 1947 as the workman was not paid retrenchment compensation alongwith retrenchment order which is condition precedent although the petitioner had completed 240 days in the preceding year to the date of retrenchment. I find force in this contention. Services of the petitioner were terminated w.e.f. 1-8-87. Ex. M4 and Ex. M5 are the must rolls showing the number of days put in by the petitioner in the preceding year to the date of retrenchment. The petitioner has completed the service of 240 day continuously in the preceding year to the date of retrenchment. Clause 'B' of Section 25-F lays down that as a precondition to retrenchment as the workman should be paid compensation at the time of retrenchment. This condition is a condition precedent to a valid order of retrenchment. If, therefore no retrenchment compensation is paid to the workman before they are asked to go, retrenchment order is bad, invalid and inoperative in law. If retrenchment order is invalid, abinitio, subsequent payment of compensation can not validate it. From the documents Ex. M2, M3 it is apparent that the retrenchment compensation was offered only on 9-10-87 although the termination was effected w.e.f. 1-8-87. Not only this the management's witness Shri G. S. Bains MW1 has also admitted to this effect. If any authority is needed 1970(2) I.L.J. page 179 Somu Kumar Chatterjee Vs. District Signal Telecommunication Engineer and 1967(2) I.L.J. page 23 National Iron and Steel Co. Vs. State of West Bengal can be read in this regard.

In view of the discussion made in the earlier paras. the termination of the petitioner is certainly bad in the eye of law and is set aside. He is ordered to be reinstated with continuity of service with all consequential benefits.

However with regard to the backwages, the petitioner in the statement claim has no where stated that he remained unemployed through out nor such stand has been taken during the course of evidence. In all fairness the petitioner is awarded only 50 per cent of the backwages that too w.e.f. the date of reference i.e. 1-8-1989.

Announced. Subject to the approval by the Ministry of Labour

3-11-1992

ARVIND KUMAR, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 जनवरी, 1993

का. था. 304 :—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार चीफ इंजीनियर (प्रोजेक्ट) सम्पर्क, जम्मू के प्रबन्धन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के के बीच, अनुबंध में निदिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण चंडीगढ़ के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 19-1-93 को प्राप्त हुआ था ।

[सं. एल.-14011/15/90—ग्राई. थार. (डी.यू. (पार्ट)]
के. वी. बी. उन्नी, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th January, 1993

S.O. 304.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Chandigarh as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Chief Engineer (Proj.), Sampark, Jammu and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 19-1-93.

[No. L-14011/15/90-JR(DU)(Pt.)]

K. V. B. UNNY, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SH. ARVIND KUMAR, PRESIDING OFFICER
CENTRAL GOVT., INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-
LABOUR COURT, CHANDIGARH.

CASE NO. I.D. 141/90

Mohan Lal and Others Vs. Sampark Project.

For the Workman : None.

For the Management : Sh. D. R. Babu.

AWARD

Central Govt. vide gazette notification No. L-14011/15/90-IR(DU) dated 5-10-90 issued U/s 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the action of the Chief Engineer (Project) Sampark, Jammu in terminating the services of their workmen (as per annexure) is justified ? If not, what relief the workmen concerned are entitled to and from what date ?"

2. For Award see reference No. I.D. 142/90 Gopal Chand and Others Vs. Sampark Project.

ARVIND KUMAR, Presiding Officer

Chandigarh,

Dated : 8-12-92

नई दिल्ली, 20 जनवरी, 1993

का. आ. 305 .—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार चीफ इंजीनियर (प्रोजेक्ट) सम्पर्क, जम्मू के प्रबन्धन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निदिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण चंडीगढ़ के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 19-1-93 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं एन—14011/14/90 आई. आर. डी. यू. (पार्ट.)]

के. वी. बी. उणी, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi., the 20th January, 1993

S.O. 305.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Chandigarh as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Chief Engineer (Proj.), Sampark, Jammu and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 19-1-93.

[No. L-14011/14/90-IR(DU)(Pt.)]

K. V. B. UNNY, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SH. ARVIND KUMAR, PRESIDING OFFICER
CENTRAL GOVT., INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-
LABOUR COURT, CHANDIGARH.

CASE NO. I.D. 140/90

Shyam Kumar and Others Vs. Project Sampark

For the Workman : None.

For the Management : Sh. D. R. Babu.

AWARD

Central Govt. vide gazette notification No. L-14011/14/90-IR(DU) dated 5-10-90 issued U/S 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the action of the Chief Engineer (Project) Sampark, Jammu in terminating the services of their workmen (as per annexure) is justified ? If not, what relief the workmen concerned are entitled to and from what date ?"

2. For Award see reference No. I.D. 142/90 Gopal Chand and Others Vs. Sampark Project.

ARVIND KUMAR, Presiding Officer

Chandigarh,

Dated : 8-12-92

नई दिल्ली, 20 जनवरी, 1993

का. आ. 306 .—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार चीफ इंजीनियर (प्रोजेक्ट) सम्पर्क, जम्मू के प्रबन्धन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निदिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण चंडीगढ़ के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 19-1-93 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं एन-14011/13/90-आई. आर. (डी. यू.) पार्ट]

के. वी. बी. उणी, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th January, 1993

S.O. 306.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Chandigarh as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Chief Engineer (Proj.), Sampark, Jammu and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 19-1-93.

[No. L-14011/13/90-IR(DU)(Pt.)]

K. V. B. UNNY, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SH. ARVIND KUMAR, PRESIDING OFFICER
CENTRAL GOVT., INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-
LABOUR COURT, CHANDIGARH.

CASE NO. I.D. 139/90

Maggar and Others Vs. Sampark Project.

For the Workman : None.

For the Management : Sh. D. R. Babu.

AWARD

Central Govt. vide gazette notification No. L-14011/13/90-IR(DU) dated 5-10-90 issued U/S 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the action of the Chief Engineer (Project) Sampark, Jammu in terminating the services of their workmen (as per annexure) is justified ? If not, what relief the workmen concerned are entitled to and from what date ?"

2. For Award see reference No. I.D. 142/90 Gopal Chand and Others Vs. Sampark Project.

ARVIND KUMAR, Presiding Officer

Chandigarh,

Dated : 8-12-92

नई दिल्ली, 20 जनवरी, 1993

का. आ. 07 .—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार चीफ इंजीनियर (प्रोजेक्ट) सम्पर्क, जम्मू के प्रबन्धन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निदिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण चंडीगढ़ के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 19-1-93 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एन—14011/12/90-आई. आर. (डी. यू.) पार्ट]

के. वी. बी. उणी, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th January, 1993

ANNEXURE

S.O. 307.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Chandigarh as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Chief Engineer (Proj.), Sampark, Jammu and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 19-1-93.

[No. L-14011/12/90-IR(DU)(Pt.)]
K. V. B. UNNY, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SH. ARVIND KUMAR, PRESIDING OFFICER
CENTRAL GOVT., INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-
LABOUR COURT, CHANDIGARH.

CASE NO. I.D. 138/90

Sita Ram and Others Vs. Project Sampark.

For the Workman : None.

For the Management : Sh. D. R. Babu.

AWARD

Central Govt. vide gazette notification No. L-14011/12/90-IR(DU) dated 5-10-89 issued U/s 10(i)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947, referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the action of the Chief Engineer (Project) Sampark, Jammu in terminating the services of their workmen (as per annexure) is justified ? If not, what relief the workmen concerned are entitled to and from what date ?"

2. For Award see reference No. I.D. 142/90 Gopal Chand and Others Vs. Sampark Project.

ARVIND KUMAR, Presiding Officer

Dated : 8-12-92
Chandigarh,

नई दिल्ली, 20 जनवरी, 1993

का. आ. 308 :—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार चीफ इंजीनियर (प्रोजेक्ट) सम्पर्क, जम्मू के प्रबन्धन के संबंध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण चंडीगढ़ के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 19-1-93 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-14011/11/90—आई. आर. (डी. यू.) पार्ट]
के. वी. बी. उण्णी, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th January, 1993

S.O. 308.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Chandigarh as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Chief Engineer (Proj.), Sampark, Jammu and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 19-1-93.

[No. L-14011/11/90-IR(DU)(Pt.)]
K. V. B. UNNY, Desk Officer

BEFORE SH. ARVIND KUMAR, PRESIDING OFFICER
CENTRAL GOVT., INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-
LABOUR COURT, CHANDIGARH.

CASE NO. I.D. 137/90

Ram Chand and Others Vs. Project Sampark.

For the Workman : None.

For the Management : Sh. D. R. Babu.

AWARD

Central Govt. vide Gazette notification No. L-14011/11/90-IR(DU) dated 5-10-90 issued U/s 10(i)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the action of the Chief Engineer (Project) Sampark, Jammu in terminating the services of their workmen (as per annexure) is justified ? If not, what relief the workmen concerned are entitled to and from what date ?"

2. For Award see reference No. I.D. 142/90 Gopal Chand and Others Vs. Sampark Project.

ARVIND KUMAR, Presiding Officer

Chandigarh,

Dated : 8-12-92

नई दिल्ली, 20 जनवरी, 1993

का. आ. 309 :—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार चीफ इंजीनियर (प्रोजेक्ट) सम्पर्क, जम्मू के प्रबन्धन के संबंध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण चंडीगढ़ के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 19-1-93 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-14011/10/90—आई. आर. (डी. यू.) (पार्ट)]
के. वी. बी. उण्णी, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th January, 1993

S.O. 309.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Chandigarh as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Chief Engineer (Proj.), Sampark, Jammu and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 19-1-93.

[No. L-14011/10/90-IR(DU)(Pt.)]

K. V. B. UNNY, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SH. ARVIND KUMAR, PRESIDING OFFICER
CENTRAL GOVT., INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-
LABOUR COURT, CHANDIGARH.

CASE NO. I.D. 136/90

Het Ram and Others Vs. Project Sampark.

For the Workman : None.

For the Management : Sh. D. R. Babu.

AWARD

Central Govt. vide Gazette notification No. L-14011/10/90-IR(DU) dated 5-10-90 issued U/s 10(i)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the action of the Chief Engineer (Project) Sampark, Jammu in terminating the services of their workmen (as per annexure) is justified? If not, what relief the workmen concerned are entitled to and from what date?"

2. For Award see reference No. I.D. 142/90 Gopal Chand and Others Vs. Sampark Project.

ARVIND KUMAR, Presiding Officer

Chandigarh,

Dated : 8-12-92

नई दिल्ली, 20 जनवरी, 1993

का. आ. 310 :—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसर्गण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार चीफ इंजीनियर (प्रोजेक्ट) सम्पर्क, जम्मू के प्रबन्धन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, चंडीगढ़ के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 19-1-93 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-14011/9/90-आई. आर. (डीयू.) (पार्ट)]

के. वी. बी. उण्णी, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th January, 1993

S.O. 310.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Chandigarh as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Chief Engineer (Proj.), Sampark, Jammu and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 19-1-93.

[No. L 14011/9/90-IR(DU)(Pt.)]

K. V. B. UNNY, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SH. ARVIND KUMAR, PRESIDING OFFICER
CENTRAL GOVT., INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-
LABOUR COURT, CHANDIGARH.

CASE NO. I.D. 135/90

Balak Ram Vs. Project Sampark.

For the Workman : None.

For the Management : Sh. D. R. Babu.

AWARD

Central Govt. vide Gazette notification No. L-14011/9/90-IR(DU) dated 5-10-90 issued U/s 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the action of the Chief Engineer (Project) Sampark, Jammu in terminating the services of their workmen (as per annexure) is justified? If not, what relief the workmen concerned are entitled to and from what date?"

2. For Award see reference No. I.D. 142/90 Gopal Chand and Others Vs. Sampark Project.

ARVIND KUMAR, Presiding Officer

Chandigarh,

Dated : 8-12-92

नई दिल्ली, 20 जनवरी, 1993

का. आ. 311 :—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसर्गण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार चीफ इंजीनियर (प्रोजेक्ट) सम्पर्क, जम्मू के प्रबन्धन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के

बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण चंडीगढ़ के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 19-1-93 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-14011/8/90-आई. आर. (डीयू.) (पार्ट)]

के. वी. बी. उण्णी, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th January, 1993

S.O. 311.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Chandigarh as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Chief Engineer (Proj.), Sampark, Jammu and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 19-1-93.

[No. L-14011/8/90-IR(DU)(Pt.)]

K. V. B. UNNY, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SH. ARVIND KUMAR, PRESIDING OFFICER
CENTRAL GOVT., INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-
LABOUR COURT, CHANDIGARH.

CASE NO. I.D. 134/90

Ramesh Lal and Others Vs. Sampark Project.

For the Workman : None.

For the Management : Sh. D. R. Babu.

AWARD

Central Govt. vide Gazette notification No. L-11011/8/90-IR(DU) dated 25-10-90 issued U/s 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the action of the Chief Engineer (Project) Sampark, Jammu in terminating the services of their workmen (as per annexure) is justified? If not, what relief the workmen concerned are entitled to and from what date?"

2. For Award see reference No. I.D. 142/90 Gopal Chand and Others Vs. Sampark Project.

ARVIND KUMAR, Presiding Officer

Chandigarh,

Dated : 8-12-92

नई दिल्ली, 20 जनवरी, 1993

का. आ. 312 :—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसर्गण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार चीफ इंजीनियर (प्रोजेक्ट) सम्पर्क, जम्मू के प्रबन्धन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण चंडीगढ़ के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 19-1-93 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[एल-14011/7/90-आई. आर. (डीयू.) (पार्ट.)]

के. वी. बी. उण्णी, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th January, 1993

S.O. 312.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Chandigarh as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Chief Engineer (Proj.), Sampark, Jammu and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 19-1-93.

[No. L-14011/7/90-IR(DU)(Pt.)]

K. V. B. UNNY, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SH. ARVIND KUMAR, PRESIDING OFFICER
CENTRAL GOVT., INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-
LABOUR COURT, CHANDIGARH

CASE NO. I.D. 133/90

S/Sh. Rail Bai and Others Vs. Sampark Project.

For the Workman : None.

For the Management : Sh. D. R. Babu.

AWARD

Central Govt. vide gazette notification No. L-14011/790-IR(DU) dated 25-9-90 issued U/s 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the action of the Chief Engineer (Project) Sampark, Jammu in terminating the services of their workmen (as per annexure) is justified? If not, what relief the workmen concerned are entitled to and from what date?"

2. For Award see reference No. I.D. 142/90 Gopal Chand Vs. Sampark Project.
Chandigarh,

ARVIND KUMAR, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 जनवरी, 1993

का. आ. 313 -- औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार चीफ इंजीनियर (प्रोजेक्ट) सम्पर्क, जम्मू के प्रबन्धतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निहित औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, चंडीगढ़ के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 19-1-93 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-14011/10/98--आई आर(बीयू) (पार्ट.)]

के. बी. बी. उण्णी, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th January, 1993

S.O. 313.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Chandigarh as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Chief Engineer (Proj.) Sampark, Jammu and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 19-1-1993.

[No. L-14011/10/89-IR (DU) (Pt.)]
K. V. B. UNNY, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI ARVIND KUMAR, PRESIDING OFFICER,
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-
CUM-LABOUR COURT, CHANDIGARH

Case No. 120/90

Mate Janak Ram and 30 Others.

Vs.

Project Sampark.

For the Workman—None.

For the Management—Shri D. R. Babu.

AWARD

Central Government vide Gazette Notification No. L-14011/10 89-IR (D) dated 18-9-90 issued U/S 10(1)(d) of the I. D. Act 1947 referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the action of the Chief Engineer (Project) Sampark, Jammu in terminating the services of Mate Janak Ram and Co. 30 others Labours w.e.f.

10-4-89 is justified. If not, what relief the workmen concerned are entitled to?"

2. For award see reference No. I. D. 142/90 Gopal Chand and others Vs. Sampark Project.

Chandigarh

Dated : 8-12-1992.

ARVIND KUMAR, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 जनवरी, 1993

का. आ. 314 :—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार चीफ इंजीनियर, प्रोजेक्ट सम्पर्क, जम्मू के प्रबन्धतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निहित औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण चंडीगढ़ के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 19-1-93 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-14011/9/89--आई आर(डी यू) (पार्ट.)]

के. बी. बी. उण्णी, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th January, 1993

S.O. 314.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Chandigarh as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Chief Engineer Project Sampark, Jammu and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 19-1-1993.

[No. L-14011/9/89-IR (DU) (Pt.)]
K. V. B. UNNY, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI ARVIND KUMAR, PRESIDING OFFICER,
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-
CUM-LABOUR COURT, CHANDIGARH

Case No. I. D. 119/90

Kumar Bai and 10 others.

Vs.

Project Sampark.

For the Workman—None.

For the Management—Shri D. R. Babu.

AWARD

Central Government vide Gazette Notification No. L-14011/9/89/IR (DU) dated 18-9-90 issued U/S 10(1)(d) of the I. D. Act, 1947 referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :—

"Whether the action of the Chief Engineer Project Sampark, Jammu in terminating the services of the Kumar Bai and 10 others w.e.f. 1-4-89 is justified? If not, to what relief the workmen concerned are entitled to?"

2. For award see reference I. D. 142/90 Gopal Chand and others Vs. Sampark Project.

Chandigarh

Dated : 8-12-1992.

ARVIND KUMAR, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 जनवरी, 1993

का. आ. 315 :—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार चीफ इंजीनियर, बी. ई. सी. ओ. एन. (जी. आर. ई. एफ.) श्रीनगर के प्रबन्धतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निहित औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण

चंडीगढ़ के पंचवट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 19-1-93 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एन.—14011/18/90—आई आर (डीयू) (पाटं.)]
के. वी. बी. उण्णी, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th January, 1993

S.O. 315.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Chandigarh as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Chief Engineer, BECON (GREF) Srinagar and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 19-1-1993.

[No. L-14011/18/90-IR (DU) (Pt.)]

K. V. B. UNNY, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI ARVIND KUMAR, PRESIDING OFFICER,
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-
CUM-LABOUR COURT, CHANDIGARH

Case No. I. D. 9/91

Bisahn Bai.

Vs.

BECON (GREF)

For the Workman—None.

For the Management—Shri Amar Singh.

AWARD

Central Government vide Gazette Notification No. L-144011/18/90-IR (DU) dated the 23rd January, 1991 issued U/S 10(1)(d) of the I. D. Act, 1947 referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

“Whether the action of the Chief Engineer, BECON (GREF) Srinagar in terminating the services of Bisahn Bai, Sya Bai Kousalya Bai, Adhan Bai and Kera Bai w.e.f. 20-3-89 and Anand Kumar, Savitri Bai, Fiatin Bai and Saroj Bai 31-3-89 is justified ? If not, to what relief the concerned workmen are entitled to ?”

2. For award see Reference No. I.D. 142/90 Gopal Chand Vs. Sampark Project.

Chandigarh,

Dated : 8-12-1992.

ARVIND KUMAR, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 जनवरी, 1993

का. मा. 316.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार चीफ इंजीनियर (प्रोजेक्ट) सम्पर्क, जम्मू के प्रबन्धन के संबंध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण चंडीगढ़ के पंचवट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 19-1-93 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एन.—14011/5/89—आई आर (डीयू) (पाटं.)]
के. वी. बी. उण्णी, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th January, 1993

S.O. 316.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Chandigarh as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Chief Engineer (Project) Sampark,

Jammu and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 19-1-1993.

[No. L-14011/5/89-IR (DU) (Pt.)]

K. V. B. UNNY, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI ARVIND KUMAR, PRESIDING OFFICER,
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-
CUM-LABOUR COURT, CHANDIGARH

Case No. I. D. 75/90

Workmen

Vs.

(Project) Sampark.

For the Workman—None.

For the Management—Shri D. R. Babu.

AWARD

Central Government vide Gazette Notification No. L-14011/5/89-IR (DU) dated the 31st May, 1990 issued U/S 10(1)(d) of the I.D. 1947 referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

“Whether the action of the Chief Engineer (Project) Sampark Jammu in denying to the C.P. Labour employed in Jammu region the wages at par being paid to the workmen of Project Beacon is justified ? If not then what other relief the workmen are entitled to and with what effect ?”

2. For Award see reference No. I. D. 142/90 Gopal Chand Vs. Sampark Project.

Chandigarh

Dated : 8-12-1992.

ARVIND KUMAR, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 जनवरी, 1993

का. मा. 317.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार चीफ इंजीनियर (प्रोजेक्ट) सम्पर्क, जम्मू के प्रबन्धन के संबंध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण चंडीगढ़ के पंचवट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 19-1-93 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एन.—14011/16/90—आई आर (डीयू) (पाटं.)]
के. वी. बी. उण्णी, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th January, 1993

S.O. 317.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Chandigarh as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Chief Engineer (Project) Sampark, Jammu and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 19-1-1993.

[No. L-14011/16/90-IR (DU) (Pt.)]

K. V. B. UNNY, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI ARVIND KUMAR, PRESIDING OFFICER,
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-
CUM-LABOUR COURT, CHANDIGARH

Case No. I. D. 142/90

Gopal Chand and others

Vs.

Sampark Project.

For the workmen—None.

For the management—Shri D. R. Babu.

AWARD

Central Govt. vide Gazette Notification No. L-140011/16/90-IR (DU) dated 5th October 1990 issued U/S 10(1)(d) of the I. D. Act, 1947 referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the action of the Chief Engineer (Project) Sampark, Jammu in terminating the services of their workmen (as per annexure) is justified? If not, what relief the workmen concerned are entitled to and from what date?"

2. With this order reference No. 75/90, 112/90, 119/90, 120/90, 121/90, 122/90, 123/90, 132/90, 133/90, 134/90, 135/90, 136/90, 137/90, 138/90, 139/90, 140/90, 141/90 and I. D. 9/91 shall also be disposed of which involve common question of law on the point of jurisdiction.

All these workmen raised industrial dispute against their termination regularisation against the Respd. Border Road Organisation where they are working. However Respd. GREF moved an application with regard to the maintainability of the dispute in this Court on the ground that 'GREF' is not an 'Industrial establishment' or undertaking and its activities can not be treated to be an 'industry' and consequence thereof the present court has got no jurisdiction to entertain such references as activities carried out by the Respd. relates to the sovereign functions of the Government dealing with the defence and the activities carried out is excluded as per Section 2(j)(ii)(b)(v) of the Industrial Disputes Act. In their application they have also relied on the judgements passed by the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court in Civil Writ Petition No. 5130/85 in which the similar position has been upheld by the Hon'ble High Court.

It is pertinent to mention that the judgement passed by Hon'ble High Court in CWP 5130/85 decided on 10-5-1990 were challenged in Letter Patent Appeal No. 1010/90 and in wake of said pendency of LPA the present reference were being adjourned. The said LPA was also dismissed on 19-7-1992 upholding the decision of Hon'ble Single Judge.

Notices were issued to the petitioners in respect of the present reference but they had not put up appearances. The management was called upon to lead evidence. In their evidence Mr. D. R. Babu had put appearance and tender in evidence copy of the judgements in LPA as Ex. M-1 and closed the evidence.

The judgement passed by Hon'ble High Court in CWP 5130/85. By Hon'ble Mr. Justice M. R. Agnihotri on 10-5-1990 and judgement in LPA 1010/90 passed by the Hon'ble High Court has been perused. Similar matter was at length under consideration before the Hon'ble High Court in CWP 5130/85 in which it has been held that the GREF being integral part of the Armed Forces governed by the Army Act and not governed under the definition of 'industry' within the meaning of Section 2(j) of the I. D. Act 1947 since very nature of the duties required to be performed by the two sets of personnels casuals as against 'pioneers' and their qualifications manner of recruitment etc. are different. Question of their being equated for the purpose of wages etc. does not arise, nor is there any violation of Article 14 and 16 of the Constitution as the petitioners do not fall in the category of 'pioneers' which form a class by themselves. It was further held that in this background the judgement relied upon the learned counsel for the petitioners are of no avail to him, as the same are applicable only to the cases where the employers happens to be an 'industry' and not an organisation like G.R.E.F. and the industrial labourers seeking the relief are covered by the definition of 'workman' under the Industrial

Disputes Act. But unfortunately this is not the position in the present case and the Court is helpless in the matter.

However this view has been posted in the LPA No. 1010/90 Dalip Chand and others Vs. Director General Border Road Organisation and another, decided on 19-7-1992 wherein it has been held that no exception can indeed be taken to the learned single judge holding G.R.E.F. to be integral part of the Armed Forces and not thereby falling within the definition of 'industry' under the industrial dispute Act. We also with respect endorse the view.

The above said judgement referred is fully enforced and applicable in the present case and binding on this Court. Therefore, following the above referred decision it can easily be held that G.R.E.F. is not an 'industry' and consequent present court has no jurisdiction to try these reference and the same are returned to the Ministry for want of jurisdiction.

Chandigarh.

Dated : 8-12-1992.

ARVIND KUMAR, Presiding Officer.

नई दिल्ली, 20 जनवरी, 1993

का. आ. 318.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार टेल्कॉम डिस्ट्रिक्ट इंजीनियर, करनाल के प्रबन्धन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अर्थात् में निम्नलिखित औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण चंडीगढ़ के पंचवट को प्रकाशित करता है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 19-1-93 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[स. नं.—40012/77/88—ई. 2 (बी) (पीटी)]
के. वी. बी. उन्नी, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 1st January, 1993

S.O. 318.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Chandigarh as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Telecom Distt. Engineer, Karnal and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 19-1-93.

[No. L-40012/77/88-D. II(B)(Pt.)]

K. V. B. UNNY, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

PRESIDING OFFICER, SHRI ARVIND KUMAR,
CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-
CUM-LABOUR COURT, NEW JUDICIAL
COMPLEX, 2ND FLOOR, CHANDIGARH.

CASE NO 121/89

Balkar Singh Vs. Telecommunication

For the workman : Sh. H. S. Bath.

For the management : Shri Arun Walia.

AWARD

Central Govt. vide gazette notification No. L-40012/77/88-D-2(B) dated 1/8/1989 issued U/s. 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act 1947 referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the action of the Telecommunication District Engineer Karnai in terminating the service of Sh. Balkar Singh S/o Gias Ram casual labour w.e.f. 1/8/87 is just, fair and legal? If not, to what relief the worker concerned is entitled to?"

2. In the statement of claim it has been alleged that the petitioner has put in more than one year of service with the respdt. management as mazdoor to the satisfaction of the respdt. It is further alleged that his appointment was through employment exchange and there was no break in the service. He has further alleged that his services were illegally terminated on 1-8-1987 without any legal notice, without payment of retrenchment compensation alongwith retrenchment order which is condition precedent and thus the respdt. management has violated the provisions of Section 25-F of the I.D. Act 1947. It is further alleged that the respdt. management has violated the provisions of Section 25-F and H of the I.D. Act 1947 as juniors namely Aditya Prasad and Dharamvir have been retained in the service. It is further alleged that there is lot of work with the telecommunication department and there is no need to retrench the workman petitioner. It is also alleged that he has put in more than 240 days service with the respdt. management and prayed that he be reinstated with full back wages and continuity of service.

3 The claim of the petitioner was contested. It has been pleaded that the services of the petitioner was terminated w.e.f. 1-8-1987. It was admitted that the retrenchment compensation was given on 9-10-1987 and thus provisions of Section 25-F of the I.D. Act 1947 has been complied. Other contentions were denied. It is further pleaded that no juniors have been retained and thus there is no violation of Section 25-F and H and prayed for dismissal of the reference.

4. Replication was also filed reasserting the claim made in the claim petition.

5. The petitioner in support of his case produced himself as WW1 and filed his affidavit Ex. W1 in evidence and also relied on documents Ex. W2 to W4 the circulars. Respdt. management produced Shri G.S. Bains MW1 tender his affidavit Ex. M1 and relied on the documents Ex. M2 to M3 showing payment of retrenchment compensation and Ex. M4 to M5 the documents showing the number of days put in by the workman. In cross-examination he has admitted that no notice issued to the workman retrenching him no reason was given. He has also admitted in cross-examination that alongwith the said notice no retrenchment compensation was given to the workman.

6. I have heard both the parties and gone through the evidence on the record. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of workman has argued that the respondent management has violated the provisions of Section 25-F of the I.D. Act, 1947 as the workman was not paid retrenchment compensation alongwith retrenchment order which is condition precedent although the petitioner had completed 240 days in the preceding year to the date of retrenchment. I find force in this contention. Services of the petitioner were terminated

w.e.f. 1-8-1987. Ex. M4 and Ex. M5 are the must rolls showing the number of days put in by the petitioner in the preceding year to the date of retrenchment. The petitioner has completed the service of 240 days continuously in the preceding year to the date of retrenchment. Clause 'B' of Section 25-F lays down that as a precondition to retrenchment as the workman should be paid compensation at the time of retrenchment. This condition is a condition precedent to a valid order of retrenchment. If, therefore, no retrenchment compensation is paid to the workman before they are asked to go retrenchment order is bad, invalid and inoperative in law. If, retrenchment order is invalid, abinitio, subsequent payment of compensation can not validate it. From the documents Ex. M2 to M3 it is apparent that the retrenchment compensation was offered only on 9-10-1987 although the termination was effected w.e.f. 1-8-1987. Not only this the management's witness Shri G.S. Bains MW1 has also admitted to this effect. If any authority is needed 1970(2) L.L.J. page 179 Somu Kumar Chatterjee Vs. District Signal Telecommunication Engineer and 1967(2) L.L.J. page 23 National Iron & Steel Co., Vs. State of West Bengal can be read in this regard.

In view of the discussion made in the earlier paras, the termination of the petitioner is certainly bad in the eye of law is set aside. It is ordered to be reinstated with continuity of service with all consequential benefits.

However with regard to the back wages, the petitioner in the statement of claim has to where stated that he remained unemployed through out nor such stand has been taken during the Course of evidence. In all fairness the petitioner is awarded only 50 per cent of the back wages that too w.e.f. the date of reference i.e. 1-8-1989.

Announced. Subject to the approval by the Ministry of Labour
3-12-1992.

ARVIND KUMAR, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 19 जनवरी, 1993

का. आ. 319 :—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, केनरा बैंक के प्रबंधन के संबंध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निश्चित औद्योगिक विवाद में लेबर कोर्ट कोर्जीकोड के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करता है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 18-10-1993 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[संख्या एन—12012/84/91—आई आर बी-2]

बी. के. वेणुगोपालन, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 19th January, 1993

S.O. 319.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Labour Court Kozhikkode as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the

employees in relation to the management of Canara Bank and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 18-1-1993.

[No. L-12012/84/91-IRB-II]

V. K. VENUGOPALAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

IN THE LABOUR COURT, KOZHIKODE,
KERALA STATE

Dated this the 4th day of January, 1993

PRESENT :—

Sbri K. G. Gopalakrishnan, B.A. BL.,
Presiding Officer

I. D. (C) No. 2/91

BETWEEN :—

The Deputy General Manager,
Canara Bank,
Circle Office,
Thiruvananthapuram. Management

AND :—

Smt. M. K. Ammukutty Amma,
Ward No. 27, Div. No. 15,
Santhiketan Colony,
P. O. Govindpuram, Worker
Kazhikode.

REPRESENTATIONS :—

Sri P. M. Padmanabhan, Advocate, Calicut—
For worker

Sri K. V. Sachindananandan, Advocate, Calicut—
For Management.

AWARD.

By the Order No. L-12012/84/91-IRB II dated 25-6-1991 the dispute between the aforesaid parties in connection with the dismissal of the aforesaid employee was referred to this court for adjudication by the Central Government under Section 10(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act.

2. After the receipt of the reference order in this court, pursuant to the notice issued from this court both the management and the worker entered appearance through counsels and filed claim statements setting forth their stand in the dispute. The brief averments in the statement filed by the worker are as follows:— The worker was employed as a Part-time Sweeper in the Cherootty Road Branch of the management bank from 1975 onwards. For reasons best known to the management, the management is always in enmity with the worker with the result the management used to harass this worker often. On 2 occasions the worker was charge sheeted and imposed punishments alleging certain misconducts on her part. Later 2 charge-sheets were issued to the worker on 15-7-1988 alleging that on 22-6-1988 around 11.30 A.M. the worker forced her way into the Cabin of the Senior Manager V. K. Sivaraman and abused him at the top of her voice thereby creating an ugly scene in the bank premises. By the second charge-sheet, she was charged with abusing the Branch Manager of the Cherootty Road

Branch on 14-7-1988. In fact the worker is innocent she has given a reply pleading innocence. But however the management was not satisfied with the explanation and hence a domestic enquiry was conducted by the management in this matter. This enquiry was really a farce as the worker was not given any opportunity to defend herself. This enquiry was conducted flouting all norms of natural justice. But however later the Enquiry Officer gave a report to the management holding the worker guilty of these 2 charges and basing on that report the worker was dismissed from service as punishment by the management. This action of the management is illegal and unjust as the worker has not committed any misconduct as alleged. Secondly the finding of the Enquiry Officer holding the worker guilty is perverse and hence basing on that finding the worker should not have been punished at all. Hence an award may be passed setting aside this dismissal and directing the management to reinstate the worker in service with backwages and continuity of service.

3. The brief averments in the statements filed by the management are as follows:—It is true that the worker who is employed as a Part-time Sweeper in the Cherootty Road Branch of the management bank was dismissed from service. But she is dismissed since she is found to have committed serious misconducts like abusing the senior Manager and the Branch Manager and for disorderly behaviour. On previous 2 occasions also the worker was punished for similar misconducts. Even then the management did not punish the worker straight away and she was punished only after conducting a domestic enquiry giving her all opportunity to prove her innocence in the said enquiry. The allegation that this enquiry was conducted without giving her any opportunity is false. In that enquiry she was found guilty of both these charges. Thus as the worker is found guilty of both the charges in the said enquiry the management has no other option but to punish her. Since this being the third occasion in which the worker is charged for a misconduct like abusing the senior Officers the management has no other alternative but to give her only the maximum punishment. Hence an award may be passed ratifying the action of the management.

4. On these pleadings the following points are formulated for decision :—

- (1) Whether the domestic enquiry conducted by the management is valid and legal ?
- (2) Whether the finding of the Enquiry Officer holding the worker guilty is sustainable ?
- (3) What is the proper punishment if any to be awarded to the worker ?
- (4) Result ?

5. The evidence consists of the oral testimony of MW1 and WW1 and the documents marked as Exhs. M1 and M2.

6. Point No. 1 :— This point pertaining to the validity of the domestic enquiry has been decided by me as a preliminary point by my order dt. 30-10-1992 holding that the enquiry conducted by the management is strictly valid and legal.

7. Point No. 2.—As the enquiry is found valid the other question that arises for consideration is whether the finding of the Enquiry Officer holding the worker guilty is sustainable. As stated earlier 2 separate charges were given to the worker with respect to two different incidents. The first charge is that on 22-6-1988 around 11.30 A.M. the worker abused the Senior Ranger Sri V.K. Sivaraman forcing her way into the Manager's Cabin, and the second charge is that on 12-7-1988 she abused the Branch Manager of the Cherootty Road Branch and created a scene in the said branch.

8. Let me deal with the first charge first. To prove this charge the management examined altogether 5 witnesses. The first witness who tendered oral evidence as MW1 is this V. K. Sivaraman, Senior Manager himself, who is said to have been thus abused by the worker on 22-6-1988 around 11.30 A. M. He deposed that on 22-6-1988 around 11.30 A. M. while he was sitting in his cabin in the main office the worker forced her way into the cabin and started abusing him in Malayalam at the top of her voice. He gave a verbatim reproduction of what the worker has said in the cabin. He further deposed that though he asked the worker to cool down the worker continued to abuse him in filthy language. MWs 2 and 4 are the two customers who were present in that bank at that time and they have also deposed that they have seen the worker abusing the Senior Manager from his cabin at the top of her voice. MW5 is the Accountant attached to that branch and he also deposed that he has seen the worker abusing the Senior Manager. MW 12 is a Clerk working in that branch and she has also deposed that she has seen the worker abusing the Senior Manager. Thus it can be seen that with regard to this incident these witnesses have given a more-or-less identical and uniform version. On going through this version I do not find any discrepancy or inconsistency. Further it has come out that these witnesses have no axe to grind against this worker. So the question naturally arises why these witnesses who have absolutely no enmity to this worker gave such an evidence against her. Thus as rightly pointed out by the Enquiry Officer the testimony of these witnesses prove beyond doubt that the worker has abused the Senior Manager on 22-6-1988 as alleged in the first charge. So much so the finding of the Enquiry Officer holding the worker guilty of the first charge can be upheld.

9. Now coming to the second charge, the said charge is that the worker abused the Branch Manager of the Cherootty Road Branch on 12-7-1988. The Senior Manager who tendered oral evidence as MW1 has also spoken with regard to this charge but his testimony with respect to this charge does not have much of a relevancy here since he has deposed only that with regard to this incident he got a report from the said Branch Manager. The Branch Manager who is said to have been thus abused by the worker has been examined as MW4 and he has deposed that on 12-7-1988 the worker came to him and told him that she could not reach the bank in time as she did not get bus and then he told her that she does not have to clean the floor on that day as the staff have already taken their seats and then the worker

started abusing him in filthy language. This version was corroborated by the testimonies of MW6 and MW 11 who are the clerical staffs working in that branch. They have also deposed that on 12-7-1988 the worker has abused at the top of her voice the Branch Manager and created an ugly scene in the branch. MW 15 is the another worker working in that branch and he has also deposed that the worker has abused the branch Manager. I see no reason at all to disbelieve the testimonies of these witnesses since on going through it, it seems to me that they have only spoken the truth. Here also the worker has absolutely no case that these witnesses are at logger-heads with her. So the possibility of these witnesses giving false evidence against the worker can be ruled out. What the Enquiry Officer has done is that he believed the testimonies of these witnesses to hold the worker guilty of this charge. I too feel that these witnesses have only narrated what they have actually seen in the Branch Manager's room on 12-7-1988, and hence their testimonies can be fully believed. I therefore conclude that the Enquiry officer is right in holding the worker guilty of the second charge also relying on the testimonies of MW4, MW6, MW 11 and MW 15.

10. This point is thus decided in favour of the management holding that the finding of the Enquiry Officer holding the worker guilty of the two charges is supported by legal evidence and that it is sustainable.

11. Point No. 3 :—Lastly comes the question of punishment. The counsel for the management sought to justify the imposition of extreme penalty of dismissal stating that on previous two occasions the worker was punished for similar misconducts by stopping her yearly increments. But even then she did not improve and hence a deterrent punishment is called for. The fact that the worker was punished previously on two occasions for similar misconducts is not disputed by the worker and this fact is more-or-less concerned by her in her claim statement. Thus it can be seen that though she was subjected to disciplinary proceedings twice earlier for similar misconducts she has not improved. This shows that she is incorrigible and this being her nature the management is fully justified in dispensing with her service as punishment. But any way the worker being a lady in her fifty's who has put in around 15 years of service I think this dispensation of service would have been in a milder way by giving her compulsory retirement. I therefore convert the punishment of dismissal given to her by the management into that of compulsory retirement.

12. In the result an award is passed altering the punishment of dismissal given to the worker into that of compulsory retirement.

13. This award will come into force 30 days after its publication in the Official Gazette.

Dictated to the Confidential Assistant, transcribed by him, revised, corrected and passed by me on the 4th day of January, 1993.

K. G. GOPALAKRISHNAN, Presiding Officer
APPENDIX

Witnesses examined on the side of the Worker :—
WW1 ... Ammukutty Amma.

Documents marked on the side of the Worker :—
NIL.

Witnesses examined on the side of the Management :—

MW1 .. Moses

Documents marked on the side of the Management :—

Ext. M1 .. Enquiry File.

Ext M2 .. Letter sent to the Enquiry Officer by the worker.

Sd./-
Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 22 जनवरी, 1993

का. भा. 320.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, सेन्ट्रल बैंक ऑफ इण्डिया के प्रबन्धन के संबंध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निहित औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, नई दिल्ली के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 19-1-1993 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[शंक्या एल—12012/325/89डी-2 (ए)]

वी. के. वेणुगोपालन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 22nd January, 1993

S.O. 320.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, New Delhi as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Central Bank of India and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 19-1-1993.

[No. L-12012/325/89-D-2-A]
V. K. VENUGOPALAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI GANPATI SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, NEW DELHI

I. D. No. 20/1990

In the matter of dispute between :

Shri Hargopal Marwah, 1/43, Gali Mandir Wali, Mori Gate, Delhi-110006.

Versus

Deputy General Manager, Central Bank of India, Zonal Office, 4, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi.

APPEARANCES :

Shri Tara Chand Gupta—*for the workman*,
Shri D. D. Kapoor—*for the Management*.

AWARD

The Central Government in the Ministry of Labour vide its Order No. L-12012/325/89-D-11(A) dated Nil has referred the following industrial dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

“Whether the action of the management of Central Bank of India, New Delhi in dismissing Shri Hargopal Marwah, Clerk is justified. If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled?”

2. This case was fixed for 9-2-93 when the parties made a joint application for taking up the case earlier and the case was taken up on 11-1-1993. The statements of the parties were recorded in which they stated that the dispute has since been mutually settled and the settlement dated 16-12-1992 has been filed and no dispute exists between the parties now. In view of this settlement and the statement of the parties no dispute exist between the parties. Party shall remain bound by the terms of the settlement arrived at between the parties. They are left to bear their own costs of this proceeding.

January 11, 1993.

GANPATI SHARMA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 21 जनवरी, 1993

का. भा. 321 :—केन्द्रीय सरकार, कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 91-क के साथ पठित धारा 87 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, मैसर्स हिन्दुस्तान एंटीबायोटिक्स लि., निम्परी, पुणे को उक्त अधिनियम के प्रवर्तन से प्रथम अक्टूबर, 1991 से 30 सितम्बर, 1992 तक की अवधि के लिए जिसमें यह तारीख भी सम्मिलित है, छूट देती है।

2. उक्त छूट निम्नलिखित शर्तों के अधीन है, अर्थात् :—

(1) उक्त कारखाने का नियोजक उस अवधि की बाबत जिसके दौरान उस कारखाने पर उक्त अधिनियम प्रवृत्त था (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त अवधि कहा गया है) ऐसी विवरणियाँ ऐसे प्ररूप में और ऐसी विशिष्टियों सहित देगा जो कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा (साधारण) विनियम, 1950 के अधीन उसे उक्त अवधि की बाबत देनी थी,

(2) निगम द्वारा उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 45 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन नियुक्त किया गया कोई निरीक्षक या इस निमित्त प्राधिकृत निगम का कोई अन्य पदधारी,—

(i) धारा 44 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन, उक्त अवधि के लिए दी गई किसी विवरणों की विशिष्टियों को स्थापित करने के प्रयोजनों के लिए,
या

(ii) यह अभिनिश्चित करने के प्रयोजनों के लिए कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा (साधारण) विनियम, 1950 द्वारा यथा अपेक्षित रजिस्टर और अभिलेख उक्त अवधि के लिए रखे गए थे या नहीं,
या

(iii) यह अभिनिश्चित करने के प्रयोजनों के लिए कि कर्मचारी, नियोजक द्वारा दी गई उन प्रसुविधाओं की, जो ऐसी प्रसुविधाएँ हैं जिनके प्रतिफलस्वरूप इस अधिसूचना के अधीन छूट दी जा

रही है, नकद और वस्तु रूप में पाने का हकदार बना हुआ है, या नहीं, या

- (iv) यह अभिनिश्चित करने के प्रयोजनों के लिए कि उस अवधि के दौरान, जब उक्त कारखाने के संबंध में अधिनियम के उपबंध प्रवृत्त थे, ऐसे किन्हीं उपबंधों का अनुपालन किया गया था या नहीं ;

निम्नलिखित कार्य करने के लिए सशक्त होगा :—

- (क) प्रधान नियोजक या अव्यवहित नियोजक से यह अपेक्षा करना कि वह उसे ऐसी जानकारी दे जो वह आवश्यक समझे, या
- (ख) ऐसे प्रधान नियोजक या अव्यवहित नियोजक के अधिभोग में के कारखाने, स्थापन, कार्यालय या अन्य परिसर में किसी भी उचित समय पर प्रवेश करना और उसके भारसाधक व्यक्ति से यह अपेक्षा करना कि वह व्यक्तियों के नियोजन और मजदूरी के सन्दाय से संबंधित ऐसे लेखा बहियाँ और अन्य दस्तावेज, ऐसे निरीक्षक या अन्य पदधारी के समक्ष प्रस्तुत करे और उनकी परीक्षा करने दे या वह उसे ऐसी जानकारी दे जो वह आवश्यक समझे, या
- (ग) प्रधान नियोजक या अव्यवहित नियोजक की, उसके अधिकारी या सेवक की या ऐसे किसी व्यक्ति की जो ऐसे कारखाने, स्थापन, कार्यालय या अन्य परिसर में पाया जाए, या ऐसे किसी व्यक्ति की जिसके बारे में उक्त निरीक्षक या अन्य पदधारी के पास यह विश्वास करने का युक्तियुक्त कारण है कि वह कर्मचारी है, परीक्षा करना, या
- (घ) ऐसे कारखाने, स्थापन, कार्यालय या अन्य परिसर में रखे गए किसी रजिस्टर लेखा बही या अन्य दस्तावेज की नकल करना या उसमें उद्धरण लेना।

[संख्या एस-38014/39/91-एस. एस.-I]

जय प्रकाश शुक्ल, अधर सचिव

स्पष्टीकरण ज्ञापन

इस मामले में छूट को भूतलक्षी प्रभाव देना आवश्यक हो गया है क्योंकि छूट का अन्वेदनत्र देरी से प्राप्त हुआ था। किंतु यह प्रमाणित किया जाता है कि छूट को भूतलक्षी प्रभाव देने से किसी भी व्यक्ति के हित पर प्रतिकूल प्रभाव नहीं पड़ेगा।

New Delhi, the 21st January, 1993

S.O. 321.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 87 read with section 91-A of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government hereby exempts M/s. Hindustan Antibiotics Limited, Pimpri, Pune from the operation of the said Act for a period of one year with effect from 1st

October, 91 upto and inclusive of the 30th September, 1992.

2. The above exemption is subject to the following conditions, namely :—

- (1) The employer of the said factory shall submit in respect of the period during which that factory was submit to the operation of the said Act (hereinafter referred to as the said period) such returns in such form and containing such particulars as were due from it in respect of the said period under the Employees' State Insurance (General) Regulations, 1950.
- (2) Any Inspector appointed by the Corporation under sub-section (1) of Section 43 of said Act or other official of the Corporation authorised in this behalf shall, for the purpose of :—
 - (i) verifying the particulars contained in any return submitted under sub-section (1) of section 44 for the said period; or
 - (ii) ascertaining whether registers and records were maintained as required by the Employees' State Insurance (General) Regulations, 1950 for the said period; or
 - (iii) ascertaining whether the employees continue to be entitled to benefits provided by the employer in cash and kind being benefits in consideration which exemption is being granted under this notification; or
 - (iv) ascertaining whether any of the provisions of the said Act has been complied with during the period when such provisions were in force in relation to the said factory ;

be empowered to :—

- (a) require the principal or immediate employer to furnish to him such information as he may consider necessary; or
- (b) enter any factory, establishment, office or other premises occupied by such principal or immediate employer at any reasonable time and require any person found incharge thereof to produce to such Inspector or other official and allow him to examine such accounts books and other documents relating to the employment of persons and payment of wages or to furnish to him such information as he may consider necessary; or
- (c) examine the principal or immediate employer, his agent or servant or any person found in such factory, establishment, office or other premises or any person whom the said Inspector or other official has reasonable cause to believe to have been an employee; or
- (d) make copies of or take extracts from any register, account book or other document maintained in such factory, establishment, office or other premises.

(F. No. S-38014/39/91-SSI)
J. P. SHUKLA, Under Secy.

EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM

It has become necessary to give retrospective effect to the exemption in this case as the application for exemption was received late. However, it is certified that the grant of exemption with retrospective effect will not affect the interest of any body adversely.

नई दिल्ली, 27 जनवरी, 1993

का. आ. 322 :—उत्प्रवास अधिनियम, 1983 (1983 का 31) की धारा 15 की उपधारा (2) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय दूतावास, दोहा (कातार) में द्वितीय सचिव, श्री बलराम फुल को सक्षम प्राधिकारी की शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने तथा उन नियोजकों, जो उस देश में रोजगार के लिये किसी भारतीय

नागरिक की भर्ती के प्रयोजनार्थ भारतीय नागरिक नहीं है, को परमिट जारी करने के लिये प्राधिकृत करती है।

[सं. ए-22020/1/91—उत्प्रवास-II]

जी. के. भट्टाचार्य, उत्प्रवास महासंरक्षक तथा
संयुक्त सचिव

New Delhi, the 27th January, 1993

S.O. 322.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of section 15 of the Emigration Act, 1983 (31 of 1983), the Central Government hereby authorises Shri Balram Phul, Second Secretary in the Embassy of India, Doha (Qatar) to exercise the powers of competent authority and to sign the work permits to the employers, who are not citizens of India, for the purpose of recruiting any citizen of India for employment in that country.

[No. A-22020/1/91-Emig.II]

G.K. BHATIACHARYA, Protector General of
Emigrants and Jt. Secy.